

231. Also, petition of American Electrochemical Society, for continuance of the Chemical Warfare Service; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

232. Also, petition of National Association of Ice Industries for return of railroads to their owners; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

233. By Mr. FULLER of Illinois: Petition of S. D. Haight Post, No. 348, Michigan; Victor Post, No. 293, Kansas; General N. D. Baker Post, No. 88, Iowa; G. L. Nevius Post, No. 1, Illinois; Grand Army of the Republic, all favoring the early passage of the Fuller bill, House bill 9369; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

234. Also, petition of National Camp, Patriotic Order Sons of America, presenting remedies for reducing the high cost of living; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

235. Also, petition of Landis Lodge, No. 342, Railway Clerks, opposing Cummins bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

236. By Mr. GALLIVAN. Petition of Roger Casement Branch, Friends of Irish Freedom, supporting House bill 3404; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

237. By Mr. GRIEST: Petition of Lodge No. 134, Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks, of Lancaster, Pa., urging legislation providing for the deportation of aliens in this country who are members of the Industrial Workers of the World or other organization of like tendencies; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

238. By Mr. JOHNSTON of New York: Petition of sundry citizens of New York, favoring six months' pay for soldiers, sailors, and marines; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

239. By Mr. LINTHICUM: Petition of J. A. Bokel Co., of Baltimore, Md., favoring reduction in rate for local mail; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

240. Also, petition of W. M. Burgan, of Baltimore, Md., favoring budget legislation; to the Committee on Appropriations.

241. Also, petition of the Engineers' Club of Baltimore, favoring House bill 6649 and Senate bill 2232; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Interior Department.

242. Also, petition of Lieut. H. L. McCorkle Camp, No. 2, Department of Tennessee, United Spanish War Veterans, for increase in pay of employees of the National Soldiers' Homes; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

243. Also, petition of sundry members of the Monumental Lodge, No. 567, opposing Cummins and Esch bills; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

244. By Mr. MCGLENNON: Petition of Belleville Lodge, No. 1123, Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks, regarding I. W. W. and bolshevism in this country; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

245. Also, petition of Plunkett Branch, Friends of Irish Freedom, commending Senate for rejecting league of nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

246. Also, petition of National Camp, Patriotic Order Sons of America, presenting resolutions on the high cost of living and the Mexican situation; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

247. By Mr. MOONEY: Petition of sundry citizens of Ohio, favoring continuance of Sugar Equalization Board; to the Committee on Agriculture.

248. Also, petition of Grand Lodge, Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks, for protection and preservation of American elk herds and favoring passage of House bill 1412; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

249. By Mr. MURPHY: Memorial of Martins Ferry Post, No. 58; Bellaire Post, No. 52; Neffs Post, No. 77; St. Clairsville Post, No. 112; Barnesville Post, No. 168; Bridgeport Post; and Epworth (Bethesda) Post, No. 90, American Legion, all in the State of Ohio, praying for legislation to suppress all anti-American propaganda in the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

250. By Mr. O'CONNELL: Petition of Southern Oil & Transport Corporation and others, regarding oil situation in Mexico; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

251. Also, petition of department of labor, State of New York, opposing legislation which would place the Bureau of Mines in control of the explosives industry; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

252. Also, petition of Military Order of the Loyal Legion of the United States, New York Commandery, favoring recognition for volunteer officers who served in the war 1861 to 1865; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

253. Also, petition of National Indian War Veterans for increase in pensions of Indian war veterans; to the Committee on Pensions.

254. By Mr. RAKER: Petition of L. E. Gibson, secretary Dunsuir Lodge, No. 1025, Brotherhood of Railway Conductors of America, and Boilermakers, No. 24, of Sacramento, Calif., supporting House bill 10367; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

255. By Mr. ROWAN: Petition of department of labor, State of New York, opposing legislation which would place the Bureau of Mines in control of the explosives industry; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

256. Also, petition of New York State Association of Supervisory Post Office Employees, favoring Sterling-Lehlbach retirement bill; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

257. Also, petition of New York Commandery, Military Order of the Loyal Legion, for additional compensation for volunteer officers of the War of 1861-1865; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

258. Also, petition of National Camp, Patriotic Order Sons of America, presenting resolutions on reducing the high cost of living and the Mexican situation; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

259. Also, petition of John Mitchell Branch, Friends of Irish Freedom, for passage of House bill 3404; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

260. By Mr. ROWE: Petition of 61 residents of the sixth congressional district of New York, urging the passage of the bill giving six months' pay to soldiers and sailors who participated in the great world conflict; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

261. By Mr. STINESS: Petition of Division 4, Ancient Order of Hibernians, of Providence, R. I., favoring House bill 3404; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

262. Also, petition of Ukrainian Protest Committee, representing United Jews of Rhode Island, protesting against atrocities committed against Jews in Ukraine; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

## SENATE.

THURSDAY, December 11, 1919.

(Legislative day of Wednesday, December 10, 1919.)

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

The Vice President being absent, the President pro tempore took the chair.

ASLE J. GRONNA, a Senator from the State of North Dakota, appeared in his seat to-day.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Frelinghuysen	La Follette	Sheppard
Ball	Gay	Lenroot	Sherman
Bankhead	Hale	McLean	Smith, S. C.
Beckham	Harris	McNary	Smoot
Culder	Johnson, S. Dak.	Myers	Spencer
Capper	Jones, Wash.	Nelson	Trammell
Colt	Kellogg	New	Wadsworth
Cummins	Keyes	Nugent	Warren
Dial	King	Overman	Watson
Fernald	Kirby	Page	
Fletcher	Knox	Phipps	

Mr. BANKHEAD. My colleague [Mr. UNDERWOOD] is absent on official business.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Forty-two Senators have answered to their names. There is not a quorum present. The Secretary will call the names of absentees.

The Secretary called the names of the absent Senators, and Mr. CULBERSON and Mr. STERLING answered to their names when called.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN, Mr. KENYON, Mr. JONES of New Mexico, Mr. MCKELLAR, Mr. POMERENE, Mr. ELKINS, Mr. HARRISON, Mr. MOSES, Mr. CURTIS, Mr. WALSH of Montana, and Mr. TOWNSEND entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

Mr. SMOOT. I wish to announce the absence on account of illness of the Senator from Maryland [Mr. FRANCE].

Mr. SHEPPARD. The Senator from Georgia [Mr. SMITH], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. STANLEY], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED] are absent on public business.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I have been requested to announce that the Senator from Nevada [Mr. PITTMAN] and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON] are detained by illness in their families.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. RANDELL], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. SHIELDS], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SIMMONS], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. SMITH], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS], and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WOLCOTT] are detained from the Senate on official business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. STERLING in the chair). Fifty-five Senators have answered to their names. There is a quorum present.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by D. K. Hempstead, its Enrolling Clerk, announced that the House had passed the following bill and joint resolution, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 8440. An act to restore to the public domain certain lands heretofore reserved for a bird reservation in Siskiyou and Modoc Counties, Calif., and Klamath County, Oreg., and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 20. Joint resolution giving to discharged soldiers, sailors, and marines a preferred right of homestead entry.

#### ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

The message also announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the following enrolled bills, and they were thereupon signed by the Vice President:

S. 1300. An act to authorize the sale of certain lands at or near Minidoka, Idaho, for railroad purposes;

S. 2497. An act to provide for the payment of six months' pay to the widow, children, or other designated dependent relative of any officer or enlisted man of the Regular Army whose death results from wounds or disease not the result of his own misconduct;

H. R. 3754. An act to amend sections 8 and 21 of the copyright act, approved March 4, 1909; and

H. R. 9822. An act to authorize the President of the United States to arrange and participate in an international conference to consider questions relating to international communication.

#### PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. McLEAN presented a petition of the congregation of the Congregational Church of North Madison, Conn., and a petition of the congregation of the First Congregational Church, of Kent, Conn., praying for the enactment of legislation to empower the President to use military power and funds for the relief of the Armenians, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented memorials of Local Lodge No. 952, United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners, of Bristol, and of Local Union No. 345, United Association of Plumbers and Steam Fitters, of Willimantic, all in the State of Connecticut, remonstrating against the adoption of antistrike clause in the pending railroad bill, which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of Wadhams Post, No. 49, Grand Army of the Republic, department of Connecticut, of Waterbury, Conn., praying for the enactment of legislation increasing the pensions of Civil War Veterans, which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented a petition of Union Grange, No. 25, Patrons of Husbandry, of Southington, Conn., praying for the establishment of a national highway system, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

#### BILLS INTRODUCED.

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. SMOOT:

A bill (S. 3513) for the relief of Emma Kiener (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PHIPPS:

A bill (S. 3514) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Opp (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MYERS:

A bill (S. 3515) granting a pension to Peter L. Jaquett; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WADSWORTH:

A bill (S. 3516) to authorize the Secretary of War in his discretion to furnish quarters at Langley Field, Va., to the civilian employees of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, and for other purposes; and

A bill (S. 3517) authorizing special allowances by way of additional compensation to officers, warrant officers, members of the Nurse Corps (female), civilian employees, and enlisted

men of the Army, serving in China; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 3518) for the relief of the owner of the steamship *Urubamba*; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 3519) to reclassify the salaries of employees above the clerical grades in post offices of the first and second class; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

#### AMERICAN SOLDIER DEAD IN FRANCE.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. President, I think it should be a matter of some concern to Congress what is being done to care for the graves of the American soldiers who fell in France and what is being done properly to identify and make permanent the identification of the bodies of our soldiers who are buried there. I therefore introduce a joint resolution and ask that it be read for the information of the Senate and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 133) creating a commission to report on the practicability of bringing to the United States the remains of American soldiers buried in France and to mark and care for the graves of those whose remains it is not practicable to remove was read the first time by its title, the second time at length, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, as follows:

Senate joint resolution (S. J. Res. 133) creating a commission to report on the practicability of bringing to the United States the remains of American soldiers buried in France, and to mark and care for the graves of those whose remains it is not practicable to remove.

*Resolved, etc.*, That a commission of nine members be selected, to consist of one Senator in Congress, named by the President of the Senate, one Representative in Congress, named by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the Secretary of War, the General of the Army, the Chief of Staff of the Army, the ambassador of the United States to France, and three members of the American Legion, to be chosen by the national executive committee of that organization, said commission to report to Congress prior to the close of the present session upon the practicability of having disinterred, transported to the United States, and properly disposed of upon arrival in this country of the remains of former members of the American Expeditionary Forces who lost their lives in France through wounds or disease during the World War; be it further

*Resolved*, That the commission herein provided for is hereby authorized and empowered to take any necessary steps to locate and mark the graves of American soldiers buried in the soil of France, the transportation of whose remains to the United States may by said commission be deemed impracticable, and to that end said commission is hereby authorized to purchase and cause to be erected headstones for the purpose indicated; be it further

*Resolved*, That in each cemetery in France containing the remains of American soldiers whose removal to the United States may, by said commission, be deemed impracticable, a monument shall be erected as a memorial to those who sacrificed their lives in behalf of the cause for which the United States entered the war; be it further

*Resolved*, That said commission be and is hereby authorized and empowered to negotiate for and consummate the purchase of any lands needed for the purposes herein set forth, whether as burial lots or sites for monuments; be it further

*Resolved*, That said commission be and is hereby empowered and directed to make any and all arrangements necessary for the care of the graves of American soldiers in France, and to employ caretakers and all other persons needed for their protection and the protection of such headstones and monuments as may be erected as herein provided; be it further

*Resolved*, That all agencies heretofore, now, or hereafter acting under authority of the War Department or any of its representatives, which have been or are now discharging or shall hereafter discharge any functions relating to the location and marking of soldiers' graves, are authorized and directed to report to the commission hereby created and to act under the authority and jurisdiction of the same during the period of its existence; and be it further

*Resolved*, That the sum of \$3,000,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, be and it is hereby appropriated to defray the expenses of said commission, and to make any purchases and carry out any contracts hereby authorized.

#### REGULATION OF STREET TRAFFIC IN WASHINGTON CITY.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to offer and to have read a resolution referring to the use of the streets in the city of Washington, D. C., and to have it referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Secretary will read the resolution.

The Secretary read the resolution (S. Res. 255), as follows:

*Be it resolved by the Senate*, That the frequent personal injuries and deaths of pedestrians on the streets of Washington by being struck by automobiles is a grave menace to the safety of the people of Washington. The frequent occurrence of such deaths and injuries indicate a reckless violation of speed regulations and of the crowded streets and a disregard for the safety of the general public. Life is of more importance to the many than mere speed to a few careless, indifferent drivers of such vehicles.

*Be it declared as the sense of the Senate* that the regulation governing such forms of transportation be strengthened and enforced by thorough observation and that the police department of the District of Columbia be supported in such enforcement in all ways at the command of the Senate.

*Be it further declared as the sense of the Senate* that the Committee on the District of Columbia thereof consider and report a proper bill providing for additional restrictions upon speed at places dangerous to the general public and for more rigorous penalties, declaring in case of negligent driving of such vehicles punishment as for manslaughter or murder, to the end that the streets of Washington may not be the most dangerous places in the country.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. President, in connection with the resolution which has just been read, if the Senate will indulge me a moment, I desire to say that within the last 24 hours in the city of Washington five accidents—to grace them by that name—have occurred, three of which are serious, resulting in broken bones, concussion of the brain, and unconsciousness on the part of the victims. A short time before that a lady from Florida was knocked down and she died at the George Washington University Hospital within the last 48 hours. I wish to state that in my personal experience within the last two weeks in Washington, at places where no policemen are found, at crowded crossings and at points for the receiving and discharging of passengers from street cars, automobile drivers, while the street car was stopped and a concourse of passengers was at each end of the car, have sounded their horns, notifying the passengers to disperse and make passageway for the advancing automobile, and the passengers have had to run for the curbstone or get behind the car in order to protect themselves against the driver, who was violating a regulation of the city of Washington. No machine has a right to pass a standing car while it is receiving or discharging passengers.

In my personal experience the occurrence referred to has been within the last two weeks repeated twice, and myself and others had been driven off the street by the sounding of automobile horns. They were not emergency cases; there were no Red Cross signs on the vehicles; there were no ambulance signs; they were not vehicles entitled to the right of way. However, passengers have been driven away from the cars and driven off the streets by reckless drivers who, with the utmost unconcern, have gone through crowds of passengers.

The great bulk of the automobile passenger traffic in Washington is in the hands of careful and experienced drivers, and no complaint could be made as to them, but it is the one reckless driver by which all drivers are measured. I think those who are careful in the management of machines ought to have as much interest in this matter as have the pedestrians, so that they may be relieved from the ill will that may follow through the reckless conduct of the few who are regardless of the safety of the public.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. President, I desire to compliment the chairman of the District Committee, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. SHERMAN], in taking up this subject and looking to the enactment of laws which will protect the public in the streets of Washington. I myself have had some experience in automobile legislation, the first licensing and registration act in New Jersey having been introduced by me in the New Jersey Legislature. That act has been practically copied by 23 States in the Union.

It is necessary to impose grave penalties for recklessness; it is necessary to protect the crossings with proper police supervision and direction; but the basis of all regulation, so far as automobiles are concerned, lies in a proper act licensing automobile drivers requiring the examination of automobile drivers by a board to ascertain whether or not they are mentally and physically capable of running an automobile, an examination which will show whether they are familiar with the traffic laws, and then providing a penalty for the violation of the speed laws and the traffic laws of the city, including a suspension and deprivation of driving privileges if they violate those laws.

I make the suggestion to the chairman of the committee that if he will propose and secure the enactment of a law for the examination of all drivers of automobiles in the city of Washington and providing severe penalties for violation of the law he will remove the abuse and menace to the traveling public.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. President, I ask that in connection with my remarks there be printed in the RECORD without reading a clipping from last night's Star.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

**MRS. WILLARD DIES FROM AUTO INJURY—INQUEST TO-DAY IN CASE OF FLORIDA WOMAN HURT MONDAY NIGHT.**

Mrs. Augustus S. Willard, of Palatka, Fla., who was knocked down by an automobile at Fourteenth and K Streets Monday night and seriously injured, died at George Washington University Hospital yesterday afternoon. Her death resulted from a fracture of the skull.

Coroner Nevitt viewed the body and decided to hold an inquest at the morgue at 3 o'clock this afternoon. Charles Edward Jones, driver of the automobile that killed Mrs. Willard, was detained by the police.

**INJURED AT FOURTEENTH AND H STREETS.**

Robert Tucker, 2715 Thirteenth Street, was struck by a Capital Traction car at Fourteenth and H Streets about 6.30 o'clock last night and seriously hurt. He was suffering from concussion of the brain and bruises and was unconscious. He was taken to Emergency Hospital.

An automobile belonging to Rev. Francis Yingling, pastor of the Church of Our Lady of Victory, last night struck Miss Mary J. Baldwin

and Miss Emma Baldwin, Northumberland apartments, at New Hampshire Avenue and U Street. They were able to go home after treatment at Emergency Hospital.

Mrs. Alice McGuire, 1252 Twenty-first Street, was knocked down by an automobile near the intersection of New Hampshire Avenue and Twenty-first Street last night and her right leg fractured. W. H. Leitch, Fort Myer Heights, Va., driver of the automobile, took Mrs. McGuire to Emergency Hospital.

**KNOCKED DOWN BY VEHICLE.**

John W. Germuller and Miss Theresa Germuller, his sister, residing at 611 I Street, were knocked down by a motor vehicle driven by John W. Goodman, 1362 North Carolina Avenue NE., at Pennsylvania Avenue and Sixth Street last night. Mr. Germuller's left shoulder was fractured, while his sister received bruises on the left side of her head. They were taken to the Casualty Hospital.

Charles Ball, 809 Ninth Street, received a fracture of his left arm last night as a result of being knocked down by an automobile at Seventh and K Streets. Joseph A. Drain, 1754 Massachusetts Avenue, owner and driver of the automobile, took the injured man to George Washington University Hospital.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia and printed.

**COMMISSIONED OFFICERS AS CIVILIAN EMPLOYEES.**

Mr. SMOOT. I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the Senate resolution which I send to the desk. I do not think it will lead to any debate whatever.

The resolution (S. Res. 256) was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy be, and they are hereby, respectively requested to transmit to the Senate, as early as practicable, a statement showing the name, rank, and total compensation of every officer in their respective departments who, at the time they were commissioned, were employed by a civil branch of the Government, and the compensation such officers were receiving as civilian employees at the time they were commissioned.

**COAL-MINING PROFITS.**

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. I offer a Senate resolution and ask that it lie on the table and be printed.

The resolution (S. Res. 257) was read and ordered to lie on the table and be printed, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, requested to send to the Senate, as promptly as possible, a statement showing the dividends paid by corporations engaged in the mining and production of bituminous coal within the United States for the years 1917 and 1918; that if such information is not already in the possession of the Secretary of the Treasury, that he be requested to procure the same and transmit it to the Senate as promptly as may be practicable.

**ADDRESS BY SENATOR POMERENE.**

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I have here a copy of a very able, statesmanlike address upon the subject of the industrial conditions of the times, recently delivered by the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. POMERENE] at a meeting in New York of the Association of Life Insurance Presidents. It is a most valuable contribution to the subject which is discussed, and I ask that it may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

**STRIKES AND THE GOVERNMENT.**

(Address by Senator POMERENE before Association of Life Insurance Presidents, New York, the 5th of December, 1919.)

"I assume these statements to be self-evident:

"It is the business of government to govern, else it ceases to be government.

"Every man has the right to 'life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.'

"Government must not interfere with man in these pursuits so long as he does not interfere with the same right when exercised by his neighbor.

"Government must interfere when any man or class attempts to deny to others the exercise of the right which he claims for himself, otherwise there is 'confusion worse confounded.'

"In the United States under the Government which has been handed down to us by our fathers the right of revolution does not exist. Life and property are and must be safe and secure against any infringement whatsoever, save and except under the orderly processes of law.

"This does not mean that our citizens do not have the right to change the fundamental principles of their Government or the Government itself, because under our Constitutions, both National and State, the right to change the Constitution—or, in other words, the Government—is secured to the citizen in the form and manner therein prescribed.

"By this statement I do not mean to be understood as denying to the oppressed the right to better their conditions, but I do mean to say that under the Government of the United States there is no excuse for oppression and no excuse for tyranny. We recognize only one autocrat, and it is the supreme majesty of the law. To it every man must bend the knee, whether he be employer or employee, prince or pauper, giant or pigmy.

"The seat of the Government of the United States is and always will be at Washington under the dome of the Capitol. It never will be transferred to a place under the hat of any would-be autocrat whether he be a leader of capital, of labor, or of any other class.

"Years ago the American spirit was startled because a Vanderbilt had said, 'The public be damned.' But Vanderbilt seems to have had no patent upon the phrase, or if he had it is being infringed to-day by men who have as little regard for the public welfare as he himself had. There is no difference in kind between him and a Foster, who, aided by the extreme socialists and I. W. W. classes of the country, aims to enlist under his leadership the iron and steel workers of a nation and to paralyze industry; or a Lewis, who, to further his own ambitions, aided as he has been by the same elements, calls 400,000 men out of the mines and says to the public, 'Freeze and starve.'

"I do not wish to be misunderstood. I recognize that labor has not always received its portion of the product of its hand. I would resolve all doubts in its favor. I would deal with it not only justly but liberally at all times. If the American people have one characteristic that shines out brilliantly over and above all others, it is its innate sense of justice and liberality.

"I recognize that there are many instances in which the public has not been put in possession of the facts, or it does not see clearly through the maze of uncertainty that surrounds them, but when the light of publicity is turned on any controversy which relates to the welfare of either the individual or a class, injustice and wrong will wither away before the light of public opinion; and if at any time it does not thus disappear it is because it has become so strongly entrenched that it has become a menace not only to the public but to the Government itself. And when government itself is challenged, it must accept the issue or it ceases to carry out the purpose for which all government is designed.

"Government—that agency of our people designed by all of the people for the protection of all of the people! We almost live and move and have our being because of it. We often do not appreciate it until its protecting arm is withdrawn. It is like the air about us. We live in it. We breathe it. We are not conscious of its presence until it is taken away.

"To borrow a phrase from Vice President Marshall, 'Man is God-made; class is man-made.' Man owes his freedom to God who made him. Class owes its dependence—its bondage, if you please—to the man who made it.

"In the tempestuous voyage over the sea of industrial trouble two facts shine out through the mist of fog and uncertainty which envelop us like beacon lights to guide us:

"First. Europe shall not Europeanize or bolshevize America.

"Second. America will Americanize every foreigner who stays in our midst; otherwise he can not stay.

"Now, let us make some practical applications of these facts.

#### THE POLICE STRIKE IN BOSTON.

"Shall the police force of a great city, clothed with the badge of authority by a sovereign State, under the leadership of walking delegates, knowing that they are the physical embodiment of the law itself and the only protection which a defenseless people have against the assaults of the criminally bent, be allowed for any cause whatever to enter into a conspiracy whereby in violation of the duties they owe their city and their State, and in utter disregard of public safety, cease to function and leave the city at the mercy of the outlaw?

"Must a sovereign State let its hands be tied and submit to this indignity while some third party living without the State says, in substance, to the governor and its people, 'Restore these officers to their places and I will try to settle the differences between you and them?' Thank God, the people of the sovereign State of Massachusetts said, 'No!' and the law-abiding people of 47 other States joined the chorus.

"But it is said these men were not receiving sufficient compensation. If they were not, then those who were in authority ought to have increased it. We know as a matter of long experience that public tribunals are often slow to function under the limitations of their authority; but slow though they may have been in this instance, it did not furnish an excuse for a thousand or more policemen to strike and lay down their maces. There is one duty to self. There is a higher duty every man owes to the public. And every policeman in Boston who entered into the conspiracy to quit and leave the people of the city unprotected deserved to be court-martialed and drummed out of the city.

#### STRIKES IN PRIVATE INDUSTRY.

"I recognize the fact that when we come to consider the strike as related to private industry many very different elements enter the discussion which must be considered.

"I do not wish to be understood as denying to the employee in the private industrial world, as contradistinguished from transportation in interstate commerce, the right to strike under proper conditions.

"I do not wish to have it understood that I defend the course taken by the United States Steel Corporation officials in their relations with the representatives of the American Federation of Labor. The public generally understands the two diametrically opposite viewpoints of the Steel Corporation and the American Federation of Labor, so far as they relate to the recognition of outside representatives of labor in the controversy between the corporation and their employees.

"But it has seemed to me, as I study this subject, that it was very unwise from every viewpoint for the corporation to refuse to answer the letter of Mr. Gompers asking for an audience for the purpose of discussing matters relating to the welfare of hundreds of thousands of employees. Common courtesy required an answer.

"I think it may be fairly said, in a word, that Judge Gary's reason for not answering the letter and granting the audience was his belief that a conference with the leaders of the American Federation of Labor would have been a recognition of the closed-shop method of employment, and the real reason which prompted Mr. Gompers in asking for an interview was to get the corporation to recognize the right of the American Federation of Labor to intervene in any controversy which had arisen or might hereafter arise between the corporation and its employees. To meet in conference with labor leaders touching subjects of mutual interest between the company and its men could not have been a recognition of the closed shop.

"It seems to me that Judge Gary—looking at it wholly from his own viewpoint—could very well have said: 'Mr. Gompers is the titular head of the American Federation of Labor, an organization embracing probably four millions of men and women. He and I both have at heart the welfare of all laboring classes, whether they are in our employ or not, and I, as one American citizen, shall be glad to confer with him, as another American citizen, upon any subject relating to their welfare, to the end that just wages may be paid, proper hours fixed, and laboring conditions improved where improvement is required.' Looking at the subject wholly from the standpoint of the corporation, it would have proven of immense advantage to have gone at least that far. Certainly, in the eyes of the great public, which must always be taken into consideration in determining labor controversies, it would have presented a better appearance.

"The Committee on Education and Labor in their recent investigation of conditions in the steel industry found the average wages in July, 1919, to be \$6.27 per day, the wages of unskilled labor for a 10-hour day, \$4.62 per day, which was the lowest-paid wages.

"On the other hand, Judge Gary testified that 34.8 per cent of the Steel Corporation's men worked 8 hours, 39.40 per cent worked 10 hours, 26.52 per cent 12 hours. Certainly these long hours ought not to be permitted.

"In the opinion of the committee, '\* \* \* broadly speaking, the employees in the steel industry at the time of the strike were fairly well satisfied with the wages received, and that such question was not persuasive at all in any consideration of a strike.'

"The committee further found that the underlying cause of the strike was the determination of the American Federation of Labor to organize the steel workers in opposition to the known and long-established policy of the steel company against unionization.

"I think it a fair deduction from a careful study of the report of the committee that while some of the conditions under which the men worked should be improved, it was the demand from without the steel industry rather than from within that brought on the strike.

"The organization of the steel mills was begun under a resolution adopted at the St. Paul convention of the American Federation of Labor in June, 1918. The campaign for membership was begun under John Fitzpatrick, president of the Chicago Federation of Labor, an extremist, and William Z. Foster, a syndicalist and an I. W. W. In May, 1919, they claimed a membership in the Pittsburgh and Calumet districts of 80,000 men. In June, 1919, Mr. Fitzpatrick reported that there were 100,000 men in the organization.

"Messrs. Fitzpatrick and Foster thought the time was ripe for a strike, though the President of the United States had called for an industrial conference to consider industrial conditions and pleaded that the order for the strike be delayed until after this conference. Mr. Samuel Gompers, president of the American Federation of Labor, indorsed the President's plea for delay. John Fitzpatrick, William Z. Foster, and their

associates, refused to comply with the request of Mr. Gompers or with the pleadings of the President.

"Mr. Gompers could not persuade the men to follow his judgment. This fact in itself is a confession that the radicals had control of the American Federation.

"It involved not only the United States Steel Corporation but the independent mills as well. The men who called the strike were in large part foreigners who were unnaturalized, but they counted in carrying out the purposes which John Fitzpatrick and William Z. Foster had in mind, namely, to dominate and control the labor situation and make the entire industrial country subject to their dictation.

"I do not want to be understood as being opposed to labor unions. I believe in them; but while I believe in unionism, I do not intend thereby to approve everything which is done in the name of union labor. If I were a laboring man I would be a union man; but as I would claim to exercise my own judgment in joining and affiliating with the union, so I would accord the same privilege to every other man to join the union or not, as he saw fit. That is the inherent right of every American citizen, and we cease to respond to the spirit of Americanism in so far as we attempt to deny this right to any other living man.

"Whether the steel strike was justified in an effort to better the conditions of workingmen I shall not further discuss, but of this I am convinced: That it ought to have been settled.

"If we are to look at it solely from the standpoint of the laboring man, what has he gained or what will he gain by this strike, which was arbitrarily called by the committee having it in charge in violation not only of the judgment and request of the titular head of the American Federation of Labor but in violation of the pleadings of the President of the United States, who on his bed of sickness begged these men to defer the strike in the interest of 110,000,000 Americans until after the meeting of the industrial conference which was soon to be held in Washington?

"The steel strike began September 22. Government statisticians estimate that the daily average of men on strike during 70 days was something like 100,000.

"The average daily wage during 1918 was—

Republic Iron & Steel Co.....	\$5.17
United States Steel Corporation.....	5.33
Lackawanna Iron & Steel Co.....	5.43
Bethlehem Steel Co.....	5.68

"Estimating the daily wage of the strikers at \$5 per day and the average number of strikers for 70 days—the period of the strike up until November 30—at 100,000 men, the total loss to the strikers will amount to \$35,000,000.

"This is not all. It means a loss to the Nation of practically 7,000,000 days' work in the steel industry since the strike began. Those 7,000,000 days are lost and can never be converted into productive effort for humanity.

"Certainly the great Government of the United States, representing 110,000,000 people, has the right to say that questions of wage and of working conditions shall be adjusted by some modern method, perhaps not yet devised, which will prevent these awful catastrophes.

"When the men who are engaged in industrial life shall study these problems from the standpoint of citizenship, rather than from the narrow viewpoint of selfish ambitions and antagonisms, they will have a higher conception of life, improve the social fabric of the Nation, and at the same time promote their own material welfare.

"What method should be adopted for the adjustment of labor disputes in private industry is the problem. If the representatives of employers and of employees become more tolerant of the views and the rights of each other, as well as of the great third party—the public—many seeming difficulties will disappear.

"Though I am convinced that there have been very few strikes which have inured to the benefit of the workingman and very few lockouts which have benefited the employer, I at the same time feel that it would be unwise, if not impossible, to pass legislation penalizing strikes or lockouts in private industry; but the time is coming when public opinion will compel the adjustment of these difficulties without resorting to methods which are of little, if any, benefit to the respective parties, and always a positive detriment to the public.

"There are partial remedies which, in my judgment, may be very helpful.

"First. Require compulsory investigations and reports by fair and impartial tribunals upon all disputes affecting wages or labor conditions before either a strike or a lockout is permitted.

"Second. Provide for the Americanization of the foreigner who seeks the advantages of this country.

"Third. Penalize the agitator or organizer who preaches revolution or Bolshevism in any form.

"Fourth. Vacate the naturalization of any man who violates the laws of good citizenship.

#### COAL STRIKE.

"No strike within a generation was more uncalled for than the coal strike.

"Late in September when the people of the country were seeking to get their winter's coal supply and industry was taking practically all the coal that the mines produce, and the miners in the bituminous region were earning from \$5 to \$20 per day, and more, if they worked, their delegates in convention passed resolutions terminating the wage scales, which had been approved by the Government, demanded a five-day week, a six-hour day, and a 60 per cent increase in their wages, and at the same time authorized the international officials to call a general strike of all of the bituminous mine workers throughout the United States, to become effective November 1, 1919, unless these new demands were granted.

"I want to acquit the miners of being responsible for these demands. They were the demands of radicals and of ambitious officers, many of whom, in my judgment, were little more concerned for the benefit of the miners than they were for the public.

"For the month of October the Government statisticians estimate the labor cost of the coal mined at approximately \$84,000,000. For November the figure will be somewhere near \$28,500,000. This indicates that the mine workers as a class will receive \$55,500,000 less for services rendered during the month of November than during the month of October—all because they have been induced by their leaders to strike.

"If we count 25 working days for November and estimate the number of striking miners to be in the same ratio to the total number of miners—400,000—as the decrease in the wage cost of coal mined in November is to the total wage cost of the coal mined in October, then there have been lost to the miners and to the public approximately 6,500,000 days of work. Consider for a moment its effect upon the public welfare!

"Every reasoning man wants the miner not only to have a fair wage but a good wage and good working conditions. Dr. Garfield, after investigation, says their wages should be increased 14 per cent. But what principle of either public or private morals will permit the officers or the men, in pursuance of a common conspiracy, to stop the mining of bituminous coal of which we must have 500,000,000 tons a year?

"Must transportation stop?

"Must the wheels of industry cease to turn?

"Must men, women, and children freeze and starve while the leaders of the miners take advantage of the approaching winter season to strike and force increased and unreasonable demands?

"Must 110,000,000 Americans submit to all the distress and inconvenience consequent upon the failure of fuel supply when the hills are full of coal?

"Or shall they by orderly process and by the hand of the Government which they have devised say to the 400,000 miners, 'You shall not thus threaten the life of industry and the health of your fellow men.'

"And then, gentlemen, just contemplate the situation: Because the Government sees fit to invoke the aid of the courts to enforce the law of the land certain men both in and out of Congress declare for the impeachment of the judge who heard the case and entered the decree which compelled the officials of the miners' organization to withdraw the call for the strike. And all this is said before an appeal from the decision of the court is taken.

"Must Government control this conflict, or shall this conflict control Government?

"It is sufficient to say that 110,000,000 free Americans are not living in Russia, and they will not be terrorized by the methods of Trotsky, a Lenin, or a Lewis. If these would-be autocrats are not conscious of the intensity of the bitter feeling against their methods, let them go out along the highways and byways, or in the cities and towns, and inquire of the public, 'What say you?'

"The American people did not hesitate to raise an army of 4,000,000 men or to send 2,000,000 of them more than 3,000 miles across the seas to help destroy the imperial autocracy of Germany, and they will see to it in an orderly and legal way that the would-be autocrats of this country—whether they represent capital or whether they represent labor—shall not dominate or compel 110,000,000 people to do their bidding.

#### INTERSTATE COMMERCE.

"It will be inferred from what I have heretofore said that I distinguish between strikes which occur in manufacturing, mining, or other forms of private industry and strikes which occur

in interstate commerce and affect our railway or other transportation, and as I distinguish between these strikes, so I would differentiate the remedies to be adopted.

"The reason lies in the inherent differences in the functions to be performed. In private industry any strike or lockout in mine or factory, no matter how important it may be to the particular locality, its effect is more or less circumscribed. It may even constitute a substantial part of a given industry, and still it seldom happens that it could be regarded as nation wide.

"Again, it must be borne in mind that the Congress has plenary jurisdiction in dealing with interstate commerce, while its authority over intrastate or local industry is very limited. Let us consider the nation-wide aspect of our interstate commerce.

"The value of the manufactured products, according to the last census of manufactures, taken in 1914, was \$24,246,434,724. Taking into consideration increased production and higher values, it is quite likely that the product of the current year is very materially greater than it was in 1914.

"The value of the mineral products in 1918 was \$5,526,162,000. The value of farm products for 1918 was \$21,386,000,000. Our foreign trade for the calendar year 1918—imports and exports—amounted to \$9,180,300,255. During the current year it will amount to much more.

"Nearly all these products enter in one form or another into interstate or foreign commerce, or both. It affects intimately the livelihood and comfort of every man, woman, and child in the country. If a controversy should arise between the railroads—whether under Government or private control—and the railway brotherhoods over wages or hours or working conditions, or for any other reason, it is within the power of 2,000,000 railroad men, or even of the membership of any one of the four brotherhoods, at any time to bring to a standstill the entire commerce of the country, foreign and domestic. There are about 85,000 locomotive engineers. They alone could stop all transportation.

"Should this happen the food supplies of our fertile farms could not be moved to the markets. Fuel could not be hauled from the mine to the family fireside, the boiler, or the furnace. The raw material could not be moved to the mills. The finished product could not be marketed. Industry would be paralyzed. In 10 days' time, and less, the innocent men, women, and children, including the families of the strikers themselves, living in the centers of our great cities would be on the verge of starvation, while the food products in the rural sections of the country would be wasting and rotting.

"And if I may say a word concerning the financial aspect of railway securities:

"According to the reports of the Interstate Commerce Commission on December 31, 1917, there were 627,930 stockholders, individual and institutional.

"The railroads are capitalized at approximately \$20,000,000,000. Their valuation is estimated to be between seventeen and twenty billions.

"The National Association of Owners of Railroad Securities is my authority for the statement that there are probably some 7,500,000 institutional and individual holders of American railroad bonds. About 30 per cent of these railroad bonds are owned by the life and fire insurance companies and mutual savings banks of the country to protect the funds of their policyholders and depositors.

"I am informed that 30,000,000 people own 46,000,000 life insurance policies now outstanding, and that one-fourth of the securities for the payment of these policies is invested in railroad securities. Six hundred and forty-nine millions of these securities are held by fire and marine insurance, casualty and surety companies. Three hundred and fifty millions are owned by benevolent associations, charitable institutions, colleges, and schools. Trust companies and State and National banks own six hundred and eighty-five millions.

"It must follow, therefore, that anything which seriously affects the operations of these railroads will have a corresponding effect upon all the financial and insurance institutions of the country, and every widow or orphan or other individual who may be a holder or beneficiary of these securities.

"These apprehensions are not mere figments of the imagination. At different times nation-wide strikes have been threatened. Within a few days a strike was called by certain branches of the railway employees at St. Louis. Threats of nation-wide strikes have been made by leaders in the councils of the brotherhoods. Even Congress has been told that there would be revolution if their demands were not granted.

"Shall the Congress of the United States, whose duty it is to legislate for 110,000,000 of people, get down on their knees in the face of threats of this kind and say, 'We are powerless to act'? We will not do it if we are men.

#### ATTITUDE OF SOME LABOR LEADERS.

"As indicating the attitude of some of the labor leaders bearing upon this subject, Mr. Glenn Plumb in presenting his plan suggested certain wage boards and boards of adjustment, which, he said (Friday, February 7, 1919), 'would provide a means of settling wage questions and other disputes in such a manner that the occasion for strikes or lockouts would be effectually removed.'

"But, on February 12, 1919, in answer to a question by Senator CUMMINS, 'And are you willing, if the Government operates the properties, that you, the men, shall be denied the privilege or right which you now exercise of striking?' Mr. Garretson, of the Brotherhood of Railroad Conductors, replied, 'I am not. I believe that right should and of necessity must and absolutely will continue.'

"When Mr. Gompers was before the Senate Committee on Interstate Commerce, September 23, 1919, testifying concerning the anti-strike provisions of the Cummins bill, he said—hearings, page 44—'The effect of this bill, were it enacted into law, would not be to prevent strikes, it would simply create law-breakers. I am free to say to you, gentlemen, that if a bill of this character were enacted into law, I should have no more hesitancy in participating in a just strike than I would now, regardless of what the consequences might be.' He added at the time, in substance, that he would not hesitate to refuse to comply with the law if enacted, and he would not hesitate to advise his fellows to refuse to comply with the law.

"These latter statements were, however, stricken from the record on revision of the transcript of the testimony. In any event, they do not appear in the printed testimony.

"So we have this warning: If the Congress shall attempt, by legislation, to protect the American people from a strike involving the entire interstate commerce of the country it will be defied.

"I can not speak for others, but as for me, when men representing any interest, I care not what, come before the Congress of a sovereign people with suggestions that they will not comply with a law if it is passed, they overstep the bounds of propriety, and they weaken rather than strengthen their cause. All men have the right to petition or to remonstrate. No man has the right to threaten or intimidate.

"We are told that if this law should be enacted the conservative element of the brotherhoods would not be able to hold in check the radical element. And they refer to unauthorized or illegal strikes—that is, strikes not in conformity with the rules of the organization—as being evidence of their inability to control at all times. If they are not able to control their own men, shall the Government of the United States cover before the men they can not control? Not if America knows herself, and America does know herself.

"No labor leader will admit that he ever called a strike to enforce an unjust demand. He certainly can not claim the right to make any demand, just or unjust, and insist upon its being granted. If his claim is just, he ought to believe that any impartial tribunal created by the Government will grant it. Public opinion will compel it.

"The duty of good citizenship demands that if employer and employee can not adjust their differences, they should be submitted to a proper tribunal for decision, rather than that an entire industry should be suspended while they continue to quarrel.

"When the brotherhoods engaged in interstate commerce claim the inalienable and unconditional right to strike, they claim the right to starve and freeze the public unless their disputes are settled to their satisfaction.

#### THE CUMMINS BILL.

"Now, briefly, what are the labor provisions of the Cummins bill relating to strikes?

"In the first place, while considering these provisions, let it be borne in mind that under this bill the employees and the public are to be given representation on the board of directors of the several railroad companies, so they always will be informed as to all the operations of the railway companies, whether of an economical or financial character.

"In view of past experience and present industrial unrest, the Interstate Commerce Committee of the Senate believed that the Congress, representing the public, wanted to be just not only to the railway employees but to the companies, their stockholders, and bondholders as well, and, above all, they believed that they should not be unmindful of the great public whose servants the Members of Congress are.

"Being confirmed in this belief, they proposed a method of settling disputes and controversies which can not be adjusted under any provision of present law, or by any other plan which the men and the companies may themselves devise; and if these disputes can not be settled by any of these means we create a

committee of wages and working conditions and three regional boards of adjustment. The Interstate Commerce Committee recognizes the right of the railroad companies and their employees to settle their disputes by present known methods of conciliation, mediation, or arbitration, or by any other method they can agree upon. It is only when all these means fail that the machinery of the Cummins bill is to be set in motion.

"The committee of wages and working conditions is composed of eight members—four to represent labor and four to represent the carriers. This committee is selected by the transportation board of five members appointed by the President. The employee members of the committee are chosen by the transportation board from nominations made by the railway craftsmen. The four members representing the carriers are selected in like manner by this board from nominations made by the carriers themselves. This committee has jurisdiction over controversies respecting wages and working conditions and to hear appeals from regional boards where those boards are evenly divided and unable to reach a decision by a majority vote. It is likewise empowered to interpret its findings and to make rules and regulations for its procedure, including the procedure on appeal cases from the regional boards of adjustment, and is required to consider and decide all complaints respecting wages and working conditions as promptly as practicable. This committee on wages and working conditions considers all complaints. Its decisions are subject to approval by the transportation board. If the committee is evenly divided the subject of the dispute shall be referred to the board, whose decision shall be final.

"The regional boards of adjustment, three in number, shall be empowered to hear and determine all complaints, grievances, matters, and disputes, including questions of discipline and controversies arising in ordinary railway operations, other than controversies relating to wages and working conditions.

"What plan could be fairer?

"Which is of the more importance, the uninterrupted movement of commerce or a commerce which is subject to paralysis at any time there is a quarrel between the railroad managers and the chiefs of the brotherhoods?

"It would be wrong to deny the right to strike or to lock-out if a tribunal were not provided to which should be submitted the subject matter of dispute.

"We simply say to these men, 'Settle your differences in any way you can, and we hope you can settle them; but if you are not able to agree then the welfare of the public requires you to submit your evidence to the different tribunals we have created for investigation and decision.'

"I submit that if the railway brotherhoods are not willing to trust fair tribunals to decide their controversies the people of the United States can not, in the interests of safety, trust their commerce to men who will not trust them.

"The Cummins bill makes carriers and officers liable to a fine not exceeding \$500, or imprisonment not exceeding six months, or both, if they knowingly refuse to obey the decision of the committee on wages and working conditions, when approved by the board, or of the board in cases referred to it.

"The bill also provides that it shall be unlawful for two or more persons, whether they are officers, directors, managers, agents, attorneys, or employees of any carrier, to enter into any combination or agreement with the intent substantially to hinder, restrain, or prevent the operation of trains or other facilities of transportation for the movement of commodities or persons in interstate commerce, or in pursuance of any such combination or agreement and with like purpose substantially to hinder, restrain or prevent the operation of trains or other facilities of transportation for the movement of commodities or persons in interstate commerce; and the violation of this section is punishable by a fine not exceeding \$500 or imprisonment not exceeding six months, or both.

"It is expressly provided that nothing in the act shall deny to any individual the right to quit his employment for any reason.

"Likewise it penalizes anyone who with like intent aids, abets, counsels, commands, induces, or procures the commission or performance of any of the acts declared to be unlawful by the provisions which I have heretofore referred to.

"The cause of good government, the welfare of the people, require these disputes to be settled or decided by a public tribunal without the interruption of the country's business; and I am satisfied if this system is tried out it will be approved by the railway men themselves.

"This is not denying the principle of collective bargaining. I believe in collective bargaining. But I would add a corollary: Collective bargaining does not mean collective dictation, whether by capital or by labor. The public alone can dictate. No individual or class has a right to dictate to the public.

"The Government at Washington lives, and it says to all elements of society, 'You shall be free to work out your own salvation so long, and so long only, as you do not unduly interfere with the rights and privileges of your fellow men.'

"There must be no supermen and no superclasses in America. All must be equal before the law. All must do unto others as they would be done by."

#### PRESIDENTIAL APPROVALS.

A message from the President of the United States, by Mr. Sharkey, one of his secretaries, announced that the President had approved and signed the following acts:

On December 10, 1919:

S. 2961. An act authorizing the Chincoteague Toll Road & Bridge Co. (Inc.), a corporation created by and existing under the laws of the Commonwealth of Virginia, to construct certain bridges to connect Chincoteague Island and the mainland.

On December 11, 1919:

S. 183. An act providing for additional time for the payment of purchase money under homestead entries of lands within the former Fort Peck Indian Reservation, Mont.; and

S. 2129. An act to amend an act approved March 26, 1908, entitled "An act to provide for the repayment of certain commissions, excess payments, and purchase moneys paid under the public-land laws."

#### ANNUAL REPORT OF THE PANAMA CANAL.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was referred to the Committee on Interoceanic Canals and ordered to be printed:

*To the Senate and House of Representatives:*

I transmit herewith, for the information of the Congress, the annual report of the governor of the Panama Canal for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1919.

WOODROW WILSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, 11 December, 1919.

#### NATIONAL PROHIBITION (S. DOC. NO. 169).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying paper, ordered to lie on the table and be printed:

*To the Senate of the United States:*

I transmit herewith a report from the Secretary of State, with an accompanying paper, in response to a resolution of the Senate requesting him to furnish that body with a statement showing the States which have ratified the eighteenth amendment to the Federal Constitution and the dates of such ratifications according to official documents on file in the Department of State.

WOODROW WILSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, 11 December, 1919.

#### HOUSE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED.

The following bill and joint resolution were each read twice by their titles and referred to the Committee on Public Lands:

H. R. 8440. An act to restore to the public domain certain lands heretofore reserved for a bird reservation in Siskiyou and Modoc Counties, Calif., and Klamath County, Oreg., and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 20. Joint resolution giving to discharged soldiers, sailors, and marines a preferred right of homestead entry.

H. R. 10918. An act to provide revenue and encourage domestic industries by the elimination, through the assessment of special duties, of unfair foreign competition, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Finance.

#### RAILROAD CONTROL.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 3288) further to regulate commerce among the States and with foreign nations, and to amend an act entitled "An act to regulate commerce," approved February 4, 1887, as amended.

Mr. SPENCER. I offer an amendment to the pending bill and ask that it be printed and lie on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. STERLING in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KENYON. I submit an amendment to the pending bill, which I ask may be printed and lie on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE resumed the speech begun by him on Tuesday. After having spoken for two hours,

Mr. KING. I think the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKellar] would like to submit a few observations this after-

noon, and if it would not disturb the Senator from Wisconsin I should like to suggest the absence of a quorum. Then, upon a quorum being called, the Senator from Tennessee will submit some observations, and afterwards the Senator from Wisconsin may proceed.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. As that will give me an opportunity to get a bite of lunch, I will acquiesce in the arrangement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GAY in the chair). The absence of a quorum being suggested, the Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ball	Johnson, S. Dak.	Moses	Smoot
Bankhead	Jones, N. Mex.	Myers	Spencer
Brandeggee	Jones, Wash.	New	Stanley
Capper	Kellogg	Norris	Sterling
Chamberlain	Kenyon	Nugent	Sutherland
Cummins	Keyes	Overman	Trammell
Curtis	King	Page	Underwood
Dial	Knox	Phipps	Wadsworth
Elkins	La Follette	Pomerene	Walsh, Mass.
Frelinghuysen	Lenroot	Sheppard	Walsh, Mont.
Gay	Lodge	Shields	Wolcott
Harris	McCormick	Simmons	
Harrison	McKellar	Smith, Md.	
Hitchcock	McNary	Smith, S. C.	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Fifty-three Senators have answered to their names. There is a quorum present.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, I wish to propound a parliamentary inquiry. Is it in order to set aside the railroad bill to take up the sugar bill at this time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands that the railroad bill is the unfinished business before the Senate. It would require unanimous consent.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President—

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Not unanimous consent, Mr. President.

Mr. NORRIS. Can not that be done by an ordinary motion? I think it is in order at any time to make a motion to take it up.

Mr. SMOOT. It would displace the unfinished business if that were done.

Mr. NORRIS. It would if the sugar bill is not disposed of before we adjourn.

Mr. HARRISON. I do not see the chairman of the committee here right now, but as soon as he comes in I will see whether or not it can be done. I will wait until he comes in before making the motion.

Mr. MCKELLAR addressed the Senate. After having spoken for some time,

Mr. POMERENE. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ball	Hale	McLean	Sheppard
Borah	Harris	McNary	Spencer
Capper	Harrison	Myers	Sterling
Chamberlain	Hitchcock	New	Trammell
Culberson	Johnson, S. Dak.	Norris	Walsh, Mont.
Curtis	Jones, Wash.	Nugent	Warren
Dial	Kellogg	Overman	Watson
Elkins	King	Page	Wolcott
Fernald	Lenroot	Pomerene	
Gay	McCormick	Ransdell	
Gronna	McKellar	Reed	

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McCORMICK in the chair). Forty-one Senators have answered to their names. There being no quorum present, the Secretary will call the names of absentees.

The Secretary called the names of the absent Senators, and Mr. JONES of New Mexico, Mr. SHIELDS, Mr. SMITH of Maryland, and Mr. SMOOT answered to their names when called.

Mr. HARDING, Mr. MOSES, Mr. KEYES, Mr. WADSWORTH, Mr. BRANDEGEE, Mr. PHIPPS, Mr. NELSON, Mr. THOMAS, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. BANKHEAD, and Mr. UNDERWOOD entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Fifty-six Senators having answered to their names, there is a quorum present. The pending amendment is the amendment of the Senator from Montana [Mr. MYERS]. Is the Senator from Tennessee going to continue?

Mr. MCKELLAR. I am willing to defer my remarks in order that we may have a vote on the pending amendment.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I desire to say a few words about the amendment before it is voted on. I offered that amendment Tuesday, and at that time I made some remarks upon it, but it was late in the day, just before the hour of adjournment, and there were very few Senators present at that time. As there is a much larger attendance now than usual, I will make a few further remarks, in brief explanation of the pending amendment.

The amendment is designed to take out of the bill the provision that would put on the board of directors of each railroad which incorporates under this measure two employees of the railroad and two directors from the public. It is rank paternalism, and I can not see any use of it or anything to be gained by it. If it would serve any good purpose I might be willing to see it remain in the bill, but when I can see no good purpose in it I do not like to see a feature of paternalism like that stay in the bill.

All in which railway employees are interested is getting adequate wages and having fair working conditions, and that is provided for, amply provided for, by other features of the bill. There is provision for a number of regional boards on wages and working conditions and for a commission on wages and working conditions, to which an appeal may be taken from a regional board, and if the board and the commission can not adjust matters of wages and working conditions then a dispute goes to the transportation board, and there it is disposed of before a fair and impartial public tribunal, acting in a judicial capacity. So the employees are amply taken care of by those provisions, and why should we go out of our way to provide that on the board of directors of each railroad corporation two of the directors shall be employees of the corporation, whether they own any stock or not, and two of them shall be taken from the public, whether they own any stock or not. It is anomalous; it is unheard of. It is the universal rule that the directors of a corporation must be stockholders, men who are pecuniarily interested in the management of its affairs, interested in making a success of it. It is right that they should be taken from among the men who have put up their money to finance the corporation and conduct its business.

Suppose there are no employees who are stockholders, what are you going to do? Take two men who have no pecuniary interest and are not stockholders and make them directors and take from among the public two others who own no stock and make them directors? I think it is the intention of the provision to take from the public two men who own no stock in the railroad and make them directors. I suppose if men were stockholders they would not be considered fair and impartial in representing the public. This provision of the bill is an anomaly, and I can see no object in it. I suppose it was probably intended as a sop to the employees; but while I was not present at the committee meeting at which this provision was discussed by representatives of the railroad brotherhoods, I understand representatives of the brotherhoods appeared before the committee and said they did not want this provision, did not want any representation of employees on the boards of directors. I have heard members of the committee who were present say that statement was made to the committee by representatives of the brotherhoods. Then why should it be forced upon them?

I can see no good reason whatever for it. I am a believer in the good old Anglo-Saxon doctrine that people who own a business have a right to manage and conduct it. That is somewhat old-fashioned, but I do not believe we should get entirely away from it. I believe the people who put money into a business and own the business have a right to conduct that business, and if it be engaged in interstate commerce, let them conduct it, if you please, under the supervision of the Federal Government, under laws enacted by Congress, under supervision and regulation of Federal agencies; but let the owners do the conducting, subject to control by the Federal Government.

I tell you we are these days going so far into paternalism and Federal interference in private business and private property rights that we are getting entirely away from the theory on which this Government was founded. I believe this provision would be an unwarranted interference in the right of private property, for which there is no excuse whatever.

Is there any Member of this body who owns a ranch, a farm, or a plantation who would think it right for his employees to be made directors of his property and given a voice in saying how his property should be managed? Of course, he should conduct it according to law, and if he undertakes to conduct it in contravention of law let him be held responsible for it. But within the scope and bounds of law he should be allowed to conduct his business as he may see fit and according to his judgment. I think this provision of the bill unnecessary, unwise, unbusinesslike, and unwarranted, and therefore I offered an amendment to strike it out, and I hope the amendment may be adopted.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, it is somewhat discouraging to me, as I am sure it must be to the Senator from Montana, to argue a question of this character in the presence of so few Senators, who must ultimately decide it. I have done my best to secure the attendance of Senators. I have done my best to

impress upon them the vast importance and tremendous consequences of legislation upon the railroads of the United States, but apparently with very little success. I am driven, however, to reply to the Senator from Montana, even though the Senators who will decide the merits of the amendment which he has offered do not hear the arguments either for it or against it.

Mr. President, the provisions which are attacked by the amendment offered by the Senator from Montana are indispensable parts of the general arrangement which the bill contemplates respecting the relations between employer and employee. The bill provides that every corporation organized under the bill to operate a railway, and every corporation reorganized under the bill to operate or own a railway, shall have upon its board of directors at all times at least two directors who are selected by the classified employees of the corporation, and at least two directors who are appointed by the President, as I remember it, upon the recommendation of the transportation board. At any rate, they represent the Government of the United States upon the directorates of these corporations.

I think none of us can be insensible to the great movement that is sweeping over the world for better relations between employers and employees. That movement in its essence is a participation upon the part of employees or workers in the management of the enterprise in which they are engaged. It is not for a control in the management, for so long as the enterprise is one in which private capital is invested I think we all agree that the control of the corporation must remain with the owners of the capital invested in the corporation. I mean that control which is permitted to private interests. I do not mean that control which is reserved for and exercised by the Government, either State or Federal.

I think most of the students of this question recognize the value of conference, the value of frankness, and the value of information in conducting a great business like a railroad or any private enterprise of considerable magnitude.

The Senator from Montana says that we have other provisions in the bill which confer upon impartial tribunals the authority to adjust or adjudicate any dispute between employers and employees. That is true; but I would look upon provisions of that kind as almost futile unless we do everything in our power to create good feeling between the employers and employees, confidence on both sides, and do everything we can to prevent the disputes which the Government assumes the obligation of adjudicating.

The presence of these directors, and I am speaking now of directors representing employees, upon boards of directors is to prevent the differences which arise and which heretofore have gradually ripened into strikes and violence and other methods of composing industrial disputes.

I think it is the universal observation of those who have looked into the matter and the experience of all who have put this plan into execution—and there are a great many industrial enterprises which have put this suggestion into execution, in substance—if the affairs of the corporation to be managed can be discussed and debated, all its difficulties and all its dangers, all its hopes and all its operations discussed in the presence of and with the assistance of the employees of the corporation, a great many controversies which become very serious and which do disturb the peace and quiet of industry and of society will be avoided.

We have come into an era where there must be this interchange of opinion between employers and employees. The employee must have his opportunity to assert his views on a particular subject before it crystallizes in the form of an acrimonious dispute.

I do not intend to enlarge upon the subject, because it is a part of the literature of the age. All of us know what has been done in this respect and what those who have studied the subject most deeply hope will come from a reorganization, if you please, of this character.

Mr. KING. Will the Senator permit a question?

Mr. CUMMINS. Certainly.

Mr. KING. It seems to me that corporations of this character, especially under the provisions of the bill—that is, corporations that are public utilities and are controlled as railroads will be controlled under the bill—should be differentiated, with respect to the wage boards of which the Senator is speaking, from the corporations to which he just referred, industrial corporations owned and operated by private individuals.

I can readily see that employees who are working for the Jones Manufacturing Co. could with propriety have a voice upon any board appointed to settle the controversies between them, and that the corporation and the employees should create a board composed of employees and of representatives of the corporation for the purpose of determining any controversy

respecting wages; but does not the Senator think there is a difference between corporations of that character and these public corporations? In this case, if the board determines that the wages should be increased it does not affect the corporation. The corporation does not have to bear the burden. It comes out of the public.

It occurs to me, and the criticism has been made in my presence by labor men, as well as by those interested in corporations, that the public interest would be lost sight of; that the representatives of the railroads and the representatives of the employees are more concerned in getting together than they are in determining the rate; and that the railroad employers would too quickly concede the demands of labor, because the public would not be concerned in the controversy; that is to say, the public would not be interested, and the public would ultimately have to bear the burden.

Mr. CUMMINS. As I tried to suggest to the Senator from Utah, I think yesterday or the day before, when a dispute arises, then the public will be represented. But I can not concede that a railroad corporation is any more likely to yield to an unjust demand on the part of labor because there happens to be upon its board of directors two men who represent labor. It is not intended to control wages. It is intended to preserve good feeling between the employer and the employee. It is intended to prevent the constant and irritating conflicts which have so disturbed American life within the last few years.

I realize that if railway companies should attempt to pay their employees an excessive compensation, so excessive as to be obviously wrong, and if the transportation board, which is given jurisdiction over the regional boards of adjustment, and the committee of wages and working conditions do not correct that evil, then we must take measures to correct it. Hitherto employers, whether in a public business or in a private business, have not been disposed to pay their employees excessive compensation. There is a perfectly natural motive which protects the public in that respect.

At any rate, this particular amendment does not, as it seems to me, reach the point suggested by the Senator from Utah. If we are to supervise the management of a corporation and see that its expenses are not too great, we must do it in some way. When I come to deal with that point as it was made by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE], I think I can point out in the bill a perfectly certain safeguard for the public in that respect. But I do not want in discussing the amendment proposed by the Senator from Montana [Mr. MYERS] to get into fields which have been occupied by other Senators.

I hope that the amendment proposed by the Senator from Montana will not prevail, for it is perfectly evident that if it does prevail the anti-strike provisions in the bill would lose many supporters which they now have, for I regard the general arrangement of the bill respecting labor as indissoluble. If one part of the arrangement is overthrown it would involve a readjustment of the entire bill in that respect. Of course, if it is wrong, if the employees ought not to be represented upon the board of directors in order that their relations may become more intimate and cordial with their employers, then the provisions of the bill in that respect ought to be eliminated; but otherwise they should remain as they are.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate temporarily lay aside the pending measure and proceed to the consideration of the bill (S. 3284) to provide for the national welfare by continuing the United States Sugar Equalization Board until December 31, 1920, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BRANDEGEE in the chair). In the opinion of the Chair there is no such motion as to temporarily lay aside a measure. The pending bill may be temporarily laid aside by unanimous consent, or the Senator can make the direct motion to proceed to the consideration of the other measure, which would displace the pending bill.

Mr. McNARY. I move, then, that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 3284.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The absence of a quorum is suggested. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Elkins	Jones, Wash.	Myers
Bankhead	Fletcher	Kellogg	New
Beckham	Frellinghuysen	Kenyon	Norris
Brandegée	Gay	King	Overman
Capper	Hale	Kirby	Page
Chamberlain	Harris	La Follette	Phelps
Colt	Harrison	Lenroot	Pomerene
Culberson	Hitchcock	Lodge	Ransdell
Cummins	Johnson, S. Dak.	McKellar	Sheppard
Dial	Jones, N. Mex.	McNary	Simmons

Smith, S. C.  
Smoot  
Spencer

Stanley  
Sterling  
Thomas

Trammell  
Underwood  
Wadsworth

Walsh, Mass.  
Watson  
Wolcott

Mr. SMOOT. I wish to announce the necessary absence of the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CURTIS], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. SUTHERLAND], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. NUGENT] in attendance on a subcommittee of the Committee on Finance.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Fifty-two Senators have answered to their names. A quorum of the Senate is present.

Mr. CUMMINS. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. President. Is there a motion pending?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will ask the Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY] whether he moved to proceed to the consideration of the bill which he has sent to the desk, or whether he asked unanimous consent temporarily to lay aside the unfinished business?

Mr. McNARY. I move that at this time the Senate take up for consideration Senate bill 3284.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon moves that the Senate now proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 3284, which is known as the sugar bill.

Mr. CUMMINS. On that I desire to be heard.

Mr. HARRISON. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. HARRISON. Is the motion of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY] debatable?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair thinks it is debatable two hours after the Senate convenes, which time has arrived. The Senator from Iowa is recognized.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, I understand the Chair rules that the motion of the Senator from Oregon is debatable after 1 o'clock, the Senate having met at 11 o'clock?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes.

Mr. CUMMINS. I think the Chair is right in that ruling. I very much hope that the motion of the Senator from Oregon will not prevail. I understand perfectly the exigency which lies behind the bill, to which the Senator from Oregon has referred. I wish it were possible that we could consider all of the important measures of legislation at the same time, but we can not. It is a matter for the Senate to determine whether, in its judgment, it is more important to enact legislation for the further regulation and control of our railways and preliminary to their return to their owners than it is to enact the legislation to which the Senator from Oregon refers.

I have done all I could during all the time that the pending bill has been before the Senate, and even before then, to impress upon the Senate the importance of this legislation, and I intend to do all I can to keep the bill before the Senate until it is disposed of.

I suggest to those who are in favor of bringing on the so-called sugar bill that we hold a night session in order to dispose of that measure. I perfectly understand that after a bill of the character of the railroad bill is considered all day it ought not, except in the last extremity, to be considered at a night session, but that is no reason why Senators should not assemble here for the purpose of debating and determining another measure, which I have no doubt is of great importance, although I do not understand the measure sufficiently to be able to express an opinion upon it. All that I say now, Mr. President, is that I think it would be wrong and would be a desertion of duty to lay aside the railroad bill for the purpose of taking up any other legislation that is on the calendar.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I am deeply interested in the passage of the so-called sugar bill. I think it ought to be passed at an early day; to be passed in time to go to the other House to be acted on there; but I think it would be a great mistake to lay aside the pending bill. If the pending measure is kept before the Senate all the time, it will not be long until we get through with its discussion. It seems to me that that would be the orderly method of procedure. So far as the railroad bill is concerned, it affects the business and the people of this country to as great an extent as any sugar bill could ever affect them. It is for that reason, and that reason alone, that I shall vote against taking up the sugar bill.

I desire to express the opinion, however, that Senators should remain in their seats and listen to the discussion of the railroad bill and not have quorums called every half hour. We have had four such calls, as I remember, this morning. Every one of them takes considerable time, sometimes as much as 15 or 20 minutes. The result is a loss of time. It is about time, it seems to me, that Senators should be in the Chamber and that the pending bill should be considered and finally acted upon just as quickly as possible.

Mr. McKELLAR. Will the Senator from Utah yield to me?

Mr. SMOOT. Yes; I yield to the Senator.

Mr. McKELLAR. Does not the Senator think that the reason why no more interest is taken in the railroad bill is because Senators are so dissatisfied with it that they have no desire to do anything to expedite its passage?

Mr. SMOOT. I do not think so, Mr. President. That, however, could be developed if we should take a vote upon the bill; and I think that is what we ought to do. I think we should vote upon all of the amendments to the bill, and upon the bill itself, at the very earliest possible date. If Senators will attend the sessions, when the time comes when amendments are to be offered and discussed, and the effect they will have upon the bill is developed, it can be determined what the sentiment of the Senate is.

Mr. STANLEY. Will the Senator from Utah yield to me?

Mr. SMOOT. Yes.

Mr. STANLEY. If, as suggested by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR], Senators are dissatisfied with the pending bill, that is the greater reason why they should be here. If Senators approve the bill, it is presumed that it will be passed; but there is no excuse for Senators not being present during the consideration of a bill that vitally affects the constituency of every Member of the Senate if they believe that it is not a good bill or that it ought to be amended and improved. If they so believe, that is a greater reason why Senators should be here. Now is the time and here is the opportunity to make any changes in the bill. A bill reported by a committee is merely a tentative measure. This bill may be amended in any way that a majority of the Senate sees fit to amend it, but it can not be amended by absentees.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I wish to say to the Senator from Oregon that I will gladly join him in an effort to recess to-night until 7.30 or 8 o'clock in order to take up the sugar bill, with the distinct understanding that that bill alone is to be considered at the evening session.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I do not believe there is any attempt on the part of anyone unnecessarily to interfere with the consideration of the railroad bill. There are those who are opposed to it and those who are in favor of it who think we ought to consider the so-called sugar bill. Unless we do consider that measure now or within the next day or so, at the furthest, it will be useless to take it up and consider it at all. That is not true of the railroad bill. The country will live if the railroad bill is not passed through the Senate to-morrow or within the next few days. We all know that it is going to conference when it does pass and that the conferees will write the bill.

The American people are all interested in both of these measures—that is true—but unless one of them is enacted at once there can be no relief. In 30 days from now, if we do not legislate on the subject of sugar, we will hear from the country in a way that will not be very agreeable. We are just at the place now where sugar is going to go out of sight for all who are not wealthy and the speculators will reap their harvest.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. NORRIS. I yield.

Mr. SMOOT. I wish the Senator would say in that connection that if sugar goes out of sight, it will not be on account of the producers of sugar in this country.

Mr. NORRIS. No.

Mr. SMOOT. I say to the Senator now, and I want the country to understand, that the beet-sugar producers of this country do not want sugar to advance beyond a certain price.

Mr. NORRIS. I agree with the Senator; at least so far as I know there are no beet-sugar producers who are trying to prevent the enactment of the sugar legislation. If they are, I have not heard of it. But whether they are or not, it does not affect the proposition—

Mr. KIRBY. Mr. President, I should like to make another suggestion.

Mr. NORRIS. In just a moment I will yield. We can not get away from the proposition that some legislation is necessary if we want to save this country and the people from paying prices for sugar that will be absolutely abnormal. I now yield to the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. KIRBY. Mr. President, the Senator from Utah says that the beet-sugar producers do not want to see sugar advanced in price. I say for all the consumers of sugar in the United States that they do not want to see sugar advanced. Then, who is interested in seeing the price of sugar advanced?

Mr. NORRIS. If it is true—and I am inclined to think it is—that the consumer does not want it advanced, and, so far as I know, the beet-sugar producers have not made any attempt to advance it, then why not pass legislation to prevent it from being advanced?

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator is perfectly correct in that position; but I wish to say in answer to the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. KIRBY] that there are people in the United States who want the price of sugar advanced, namely, the middle men who will handle it, the profiteers. When the people of the United States begin to pay 15 or 16 or 17 cents a pound for their sugar, it will be because of profiteering in this country.

Mr. KIRBY. They are paying 20 cents a pound for it in some sections now.

Mr. MCKELLAR. They are paying 20 cents for it in my State to-day.

Mr. NORRIS. And the price may go as high as 25 cents. There are some Senators who say that because the railroad bill is the unfinished business we ought not to displace it, and that we ought to adjourn in the afternoon, instead of taking a recess, and pass the sugar bill in the morning hour. There are a few Senators—I think they are very few—who are bitterly opposed to the passage of the sugar bill, and if they can see the hand of the clock approaching the hour of 2 they might be induced to make an extraordinary effort to prolong the debate, knowing that when 2 o'clock arrives the sugar bill will have to be laid aside for the unfinished business. In my judgment, if the sugar bill is taken up so that there is no limit ahead, and it is known that it is going to be considered to a finish, the discussion will not last two hours, and we can then go back and take up the railroad bill and dispose of it.

Mr. President, I desire to meet another suggestion which has been made, namely, the suggestion of the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT], along the same line of the suggestion made by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS], that we take a recess after 5 o'clock until 8 o'clock, and take up the sugar bill at an evening session. I would be perfectly willing to do that if there were any assurance that at 8 o'clock we would be able to pass the bill. I do not believe there would be a quorum here at 8 o'clock, but I think we would fool away the entire evening getting a quorum; and even if there were a quorum, knowing that next morning we were going to take up the railroad bill, it would be known that all that would be necessary to defeat the sugar bill would be to prolong the debate a little, and that of itself would defeat it.

The sugar bill must pass the House after it passes the Senate. It must become a law before the Congress takes a holiday recess if it is going to be effective. Every day of delay is dangerous, because the power to buy the Cuban crop is getting more remote every hour, and delay is dangerous. That is not true of the railroad bill; and it seems to me Senators ought to be willing to lay it aside without any limit ahead, so that those who are opposed to the sugar bill will know that prolonged debate will not bring about its defeat, and then there will be no unnecessary debate. I would not want to prevent any man who is opposed to it from taking any reasonable length of time to debate it. We are late now with this sugar legislation. Those who listened to the address yesterday of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY] can see why we are late. We are in a dilemma that we ought not to be in now with regard to sugar, but that is water that has passed over the wheel. We are confronted now with a condition that demands solution at once if we are going to do any good for the country. It is immaterial who is going to make money or how much they are going to make. It is generally conceded that sugar is going to go up in price and that it is not necessary for it to go up if we take the proper steps and remedy the errors that have been committed in the past and that have gotten us into this predicament.

It seems to me that we are perfectly consistent when we ask to take up this bill under those circumstances. There is not any object to interfere unnecessarily with the consideration of the railroad bill. The interference that will take place is not intended as a blow at that legislation, and we will soon get back to it. The difference, when you get down to it, in a nutshell, is that one piece of legislation must be enacted immediately if it is to do any good, while if the other is delayed for a week nothing serious will happen.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President—

Mr. NORRIS. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. POMERENE. With the Senator's permission, I should like to offer a suggestion.

The chairman of the Committee on Interstate Commerce has in charge this railroad legislation. I am a member of that committee, and I feel the same very keen interest in the progress of the legislation that he does. I fully realize the importance of this sugar bill. I think it is very regrettable that something was not done by the Government several months ago to help out the sugar situation, but that has not been done. I realize that if we do not do something the increased price of sugar to the consumer during the coming year is going to be about half a billion dollars. I realize that if this legislation

is not passed it is going to cost the Treasury of the United States some three or four hundred million dollars to continue the experiment of Government operation.

Now, I was going to suggest that we ask the chairman of the committee to consent to an adjournment to-night with the understanding that we can take up the sugar bill during the morning hour to-morrow, and let us proceed with it and see if we can not dispose of it during the morning hour. I think it ought to be disposed of during the morning hour, and it will be disposed of if we consider this matter from the standpoint of the entire country; and if the hour of 2 o'clock arrives, and we have not disposed of the sugar bill, the Senate in its wisdom can then determine what should be done.

Mr. NORRIS. The Senator from Ohio is taking a very patriotic view of the matter, but I do not believe he was in the Chamber when I explained why it seemed to me that less expedition would be had if we tried to pass the sugar bill in the morning hour than if we should take it up in this way.

Mr. RANSDALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. NORRIS. Let me get through, first, with the Senator from Ohio. As I suggested, I will say to the Senator from Ohio it seemed to me that if we took up the sugar bill in the morning hour, those who are opposed to it might be induced to prolong the debate and the consideration of it, knowing that it would be automatically displaced at 2 o'clock. If we did pass it in the morning hour, it would take just as long then as it would take now. In my judgment we will not pass it in the morning hour, and, in my judgment, it will not take two hours to pass it if there is not any time ahead that will automatically displace the bill; and if we pass it to-day we could devote the time in the morning hour that we otherwise would have put on it to the consideration of the railroad bill. I should be very glad to do that. I should be glad to submit to any kind of a reasonable understanding, if we could reach it; but we ought to have, and we ought to have soon, we ought to have to-day, a final vote on that bill.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, I am not willing to assume that Senators are going to debate even the sugar bill unnecessarily until I have an ocular demonstration of that fact.

Mr. NORRIS. When I say they will, I am saying that without any criticism. It is a common thing here. I have indulged in it myself, and I did not think I was doing anything wrong or dishonorable. I do not want anyone to get the idea that I am criticizing a man who is opposed to a bill because when he sees the hand of the clock within 30 minutes or 10 minutes or 5 minutes of 2 o'clock, when it is going to be automatically disposed of, he consumes time that he otherwise would not consume. I am not finding fault with the men that oppose it. They have a right to do that under the rules. It is something that is continually resorted to in this Chamber.

Mr. RANSDALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a suggestion?

Mr. NORRIS. I yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. RANSDALL. I should like to see a quick solution of this matter. I am one of the Senators from Louisiana, and of course I am vitally interested in anything that is going to affect the interests of my State. The Senator will recollect, as he was at the hearings of the committee when we passed on this bill, that I offered an amendment restricting the powers proposed to be given by the bill to the purchase of foreign sugar. Now, everybody knows that we will have to purchase more than 50 per cent of foreign sugar—

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President—

Mr. RANSDALL. Will the Senator let me make the statement?

Mr. NORRIS. The Senator ought not to make a speech in my time.

Mr. RANSDALL. I do not want to make a speech in the Senator's time, but I want to make a suggestion which I think will be helpful to him.

Mr. NORRIS. All right; let us have it.

Mr. RANSDALL. If the Senator will not permit it, of course I can not make it in his time, but I am going to offer something which I think will help the Senator out.

Mr. NORRIS. All right.

Mr. RANSDALL. It is this: I suggest that we agree to restrict the terms of this bill to foreign sugar, which the Senator from Oregon admits controls the situation. We can not get the sugar that we will need unless we can buy the Cuban sugar; and if we can buy two or two and a half million tons of Cuban sugar, that certainly will be more than 50 per cent of the consumption, and will control the situation. Let us restrict it to foreign sugar, and you will find no objection from the Louisiana Senators on that point—and, so far as I

know, they are the only ones who are opposing this measure in its present form—and you can put it through.

If, however, you attempt to apply the terms of this bill to the domestic article, to single out sugar and say we must buy sugar, and we must control sugar, and not control meat, not control the other articles of commerce, not control innumerable things that the American people need, we would be compelled to debate that; and I think you will find other people besides the Senators from Louisiana debating such a departure from what I conceive to be the principles on which our Government is founded.

It is altogether different when you get outside. When you propose to go to a foreign land and buy anything that that foreign land has to sell us, let us do that, and you will find no opposition from the Louisiana people. We will take our chances in the open market; but we do not want the representatives of the Government sent down into our State to try to control our people in what they shall get for their product.

That is my suggestion—a simple amendment restricting this to foreign sugar. Put the word "foreign" before the word "sugar."

Mr. NORRIS. Let me say a word in reference to the suggestion. I think nineteen-twentieths of what the Senator has said has been an argument rather than a suggestion. He has suggested an amendment to which personally I am opposed. He may offer his amendment. If the Senate adopts it, it will be part of the law. I am not willing, even if I knew what all of those who favor the legislation favored, to make an agreement in advance in regard to a vital amendment to the bill; so I could not accept the Senator's suggestion. If I did accept it for myself it would not apply to anyone else.

My own judgment is that the failure to pass this legislation will result in an expense to the people of the United States of more than half a billion dollars, as suggested by the Senator from Ohio. I think it will approach a billion dollars. It will mean that a great many people will not be able to buy sugar at all, when, as a matter of fact, properly distributed, if we succeed in getting the Cuban crop, there will be sugar enough for all. In a nutshell, that is the condition.

It may be too late now to bring about a remedy. This legislation may fail partially. It will cost a lot more to do it now than it would have cost six weeks ago or three months ago, when it could have been done without any difficulty; and the danger is increasing every hour, Mr. President. Delay is extremely dangerous, and for that reason it seems to me that there ought to be no objection to taking up this bill and finally disposing of it; and I want to say to the Senator from Iowa and the Senator from Ohio and the Senator from Utah that I think they have seen enough now to demonstrate the fact that if we have a time limit on the consideration of this bill, without an agreement to vote on it at a specific time, we will not dispose of it.

There is a danger in a parliamentary sense. I want to say to the Senator from Iowa that while I am opposed to the railroad bill and expect to vote against it, I do not want to sail under any false colors; but I say on my honor that I have no desire to and will not unnecessarily delay a vote on it—filibuster against its consideration. I am moved by no motive now to displace it excepting as it is necessary to bring about the passage of an act that, in my judgment, is almost vital to the American people.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, I want to say to the Senator from Nebraska that I have not suggested, nor do I believe, that the Senator from Nebraska will obstruct the consideration of the railroad bill. I have no such thought as that at all. I accept his view with regard to the matter. But I can not and will not take the responsibility of displacing the railroad bill, because I think it ought to remain before the Senate until it is concluded. I have believed, and believe now, that it can be concluded in ample time to deal with the sugar situation.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President, I realize the importance of a vote on the so-called sugar bill that the Senator from Oregon seeks to bring before the Senate and which would displace the railroad bill. I am going to vote against his motion, and I desire the Record to show the reason why.

I do not minimize the importance to the American people of giving some relief, if it is possible to do so adequately and justly, in the sugar situation; but the country could get along without sugar for a very long time. It can not get along without railroads. The country could pay a high price for sugar without affecting the cost of living, except as to that one item; but the railroad question involves the cost of living in every item of human life and human endeavor.

I think that it is the duty of the majority party in this Chamber to present to the country a bill to relieve the railroad situa-

tion. The responsibility for legislation is on the other side of the Chamber, at least the responsibility for a real effort for legislation.

I have heard a good deal of criticism in the last day or two of the pending bill. Men differ and look at conditions from a different viewpoint. A proposition to one man from his angle may look bad, whereas it may look good to another man. From my viewpoint, although there are things in the pending bill that I do not agree with, I think on the whole it is a very good bill. But primarily I think this railroad bill will meet a situation that must be met, and met at an early day, or disaster will follow, and that is that the financial conditions of the country shall be taken care of whilst the railroads are returned to their owners.

I hope at a later hour to be able to discuss the terms of the present bill, but I shall not occupy the time of the Senate in doing it now. I expect to support the bill, because I think it is a good bill; I think it meets, in the main, the situation that confronts the country. But if it is not a good bill and does not meet the situation that confronts the country, then I say it is the duty of the United States Senate to pass some bill.

The House of Representatives has sent a bill here. It is pending before this Chamber. More than a year ago the President of the United States gave notice to the Congress that unless they were ready to legislate he intended to return the railroads to their owners, and suggested that the legislation should be passed before March. It was practically impossible to secure legislation by that date, due to the importance of the question pending before the committee. But when the President came home from Europe, still realizing the importance of this question, still realizing the necessity of returning the railroads to their owners, he again notified the Congress that he intended to do so, and he fixed the 1st day of January as the date when he intended to return the railroads, unless Congress legislated in the meantime.

I have heard men say that he would not do it. I do not know whether he will do it or not, but I know he said he would do it, and so far as my observation of the action of the President of the United States is concerned, I have generally found that when he said he was going to do a thing, he did it.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Alabama yield to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I do.

Mr. MCKELLAR. The Senator does not think it is possible to pass this bill and have it become a law by January 1, the date on which the President said he was going to return the railroads?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I would think so, if the Republican Congress was functioning. It may be impossible for a Republican management of Congress to pass the legislation, but I know that when the Democratic Party was in control of the two Houses we passed more important bills in a less space of time.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President, does the Senator include the Overman bill in that category?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I do not say that there have not been delays with some bills, but I repeat my statement. I know that when the Democratic Party was in control of the legislative branch of the Government the tariff bill that is on the statute books to-day was passed through the House of Representatives in two weeks' time without the adoption of a cloture rule, and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT] was a Member of that body at the time. It was because the men who were there were ready to do business and attended to their business.

Mr. BORAH. It takes longer to correct a mistake than it does to make it.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. If a mistake was made in turning the railroads over to the Government, I have not heard that suggestion coming from the Senator from Idaho before.

Mr. BORAH. I voted against the bill. That is the record.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I had overlooked that fact. But if a mistake was made, then it is all the more important that we should remedy the mistake. I want to say in all kindness to the gentlemen on the other side of the Chamber I do not often criticize, seldom do I indulge in party criticism, but I think you are subject to party criticism right now in this hour, and I am going to deliver it in all good friendliness. I am not attempting to throw rocks, but I am going to tell you just exactly what I think.

You were intrusted with the control of the Government by the people of the United States a year ago last November. Your term of control commenced on the 4th of March, and the President of the United States, a Democratic President, called you into office in May. Outside of passing some supply bills,

which were killed by a filibuster in the closing hours of the last Congress, will you tell me what great material measure you have accomplished for the country in the time that has expired from May down to December? I do not know of any.

There never has been a time when constructive legislation was more needed by the people of the country than it has been in the six or seven months that you have been in power. We had just come out of a great war. All the after-war conditions were threatening the country. You admitted that legislation was needed on many scores, because you introduced the bills and you discussed the questions here. But results you have not produced. No legislation has been passed that affects the cost of living. No legislation has been passed that attempts to cut down war taxes and readjust the Treasury balance for peace conditions. No legislation has been materially considered. The great problem before the people of the United States has been peace, the question of consummating a treaty of peace with Germany. Since May a treaty of peace has been pending in the Senate. For months it stayed in the control of the Republican majority in the Committee on Foreign Relations. For months we debated the conclusions of that committee in the Senate, and finally came to a vote, and the proponents of a resolution of ratification could not command a majority vote in the Senate, where they had a majority of political control.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator from Alabama yield to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Right there may I ask the Senator, he being a member of the Committee on Interstate Commerce, if since this very important bill has been before this session of Congress, he recalls that at any single time a majority of the members of that committee have been present in this Chamber looking after the bill? Is it not a fact that there have been just a mere handful of Senators at all times in the Chamber during the consideration of this, one of the most important bills we have before us?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I do not think that is pertinent to the question, and I have not counted the number of Senators who have been here. Senators like to listen to some debate, and they do not want to listen to others. That is a question of personal equation that does not affect the measure.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, the Senator from Tennessee is inquiring with regard to the presence of Senators in the committee room?

Mr. MCKELLAR. No; the presence of the committee members here in the Senate.

Mr. CUMMINS. Oh, I beg pardon. I thought the Senator was inquiring about the committee meetings.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. If my friends will allow me, that is not so important a question. It is not material to me whether they sit here and listen or not; what they do is the question.

This bill was taken up for consideration in the Committee on Interstate Commerce for hearings last January, nearly a year ago. There were extended hearings by the full committee.

Subsequently when the Congress met a subcommittee was appointed which gave further extended hearings on the subject to everybody, and then wrote a bill which was reported to the full committee. The full committee sat for weeks, and I want to say so far as the full committee is concerned that I have rarely been on a committee where there was a more full attendance continuously than there was upon the consideration of this bill. Many times we had the entire membership of the committee there, and most of the time we had more than three-fourths of the members there. Then the bill was reported to the Senate and stayed on the calendar for weeks, until the treaty of peace was disposed of. So that everybody had ample opportunity to read the bill and consider it.

As I said, since the Republican Party came into power in the two Houses of Congress there is nothing that stands to their credit on the ledger, not one item of great, important legislation. They have utterly failed in bringing the Senate together to ratify the treaty of peace. They have utterly failed to pass legislation that might ameliorate the conditions of living in this country. Great strikes and industrial disturbances have faced the country. The President of the United States has appealed to the Congress for aid. So far as remedial legislation is concerned not one line has been written on the statute books of the country.

Now, to-day in this hour we have a bill before the Senate that affects the entire industrial life of the United States, affects the Treasury of the United States, affects the lives and peace and happiness of millions of people. Do not forget that the entire financial credit of the railroads was destroyed during war

times and under war conditions, not merely because of an increase in the cost of supplies but because you have allowed an increase for labor of more than a billion dollars, and that billion dollars amounts to more than the railroads have ever paid out in any one year for interest on bonds and dividends on stocks.

Do you expect to meet that condition by a return of the railroads without an increased freight rate and an increased passenger rate? Are you going on increasing the wage scale, reflecting it back into the cost of transportation, without some due consideration by the Government in the interest of the people of the country? There is no way to do it now. The bill proposes a way. Have you forgotten the fact that one-fourth of all the securities in the great trust companies, insurance companies, and savings banks of America are railroad securities, and that the mass of the American people are interested in this problem?

Would you dump these railroads back without legislation to meet this situation? Would you force the President to return the railroads on the 1st of January without proper legislation? I am not a prophet nor the son of a prophet, but I say that if the Republican Party dares to adjourn this Congress without an honest attempt to pass either this bill or some other bill to meet these conditions that confront the country, the American people will repudiate them in every State in the Union, and they would deserve repudiation by the people.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. President, may I interrupt the Senator?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Certainly.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I should like to have the Senator say to the Members of the Senate, on this side at least, whether he advises Senators to vote for the bill as it has been reported from the committee. I will frankly say to the Senator that, as at present advised, I do not feel friendly to the report which has been made. I should like to have the Senator from Alabama say whether he advises the Democratic Members of the Senate to vote for the bill which has been reported from the committee.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will say that there are some features of the bill of which I do not altogether approve, but it has been rarely the case that I have seen a bill of great importance come before the Senate of which I approved of every feature.

But I do say that the cardinal features of the bill are such that I believe it will protect the financial conditions of the railroads and at the same time not unduly burden the people; that it adopts machinery by which the situation can be worked out justly by the boards appointed by the Government; and so far as I am concerned I shall most cheerfully support the bill. I believe it is the part of wisdom that the Democratic membership in this Chamber should support the Republicans in an effort to pass the bill. But if they do not pass this bill, then they certainly should not want to sidetrack it. It is their duty to aid the majority in the Senate to pass constructive legislation to meet the situation. Then if the other side fail to respond to their duty to the country the people of the United States will know where the responsibility lies and who must take responsibility home with them.

I say the Republican side of the Senate can escape this responsibility no longer. There is no constructive legislation of any kind upon the statute books that is material, with all these months passed by. Senators on the other side of the Chamber are in the majority, but it is our duty to help you in constructive legislation, and, so far as I am concerned, you shall have my help. But a motion now comes from your side of the Chamber to postpone action on a bill that is of the greatest importance to the people of the United States. It is true that the motion is in reference to a question that is vital to the American people, but you have 30 days in which to decide it. If it is passed any time within 30 days, it will be effective, while this legislation ought to be disposed of in 10 days. If Senators did not attempt by the length of their speeches to delay action, we could dispose of it in 10 days. If we had a reasonable cloture rule in this Chamber, without undue limitation upon debate, we could dispose of it in a week. The country is suffering until the legislation shall be disposed of.

I want the RECORD to show how many men on the other side of the Chamber are willing to lay this bill aside. You may say you will lay it aside for an hour to-day, but if you lay this bill aside for the sugar bill what are you going to lay it aside for to-morrow? Are you going to let the Christmas holidays come without action and the 1st of January come and invite the President of the United States to return the railroads to their owners without remedial legislation that is so necessary for their protection?

Mr. President, much as I would like to see an opportunity for consideration of the important measure proposed by the Senator from Oregon, I believe it would be most unwise, it would be bordering almost on a legislative crime, for the majority party in control of the Senate to displace this important railroad bill for any reason. I believe I can say to my colleagues on this side of the Chamber, to those who think the bill is adequate and those who believe it is inadequate to meet the situation, that we all realize the importance of some kind of legislation on the subject of the railroad question. We all know that for more than a year the President has been asking for legislation of some kind. I say that we can not escape the responsibility, whether we intend to vote for the bill as it stands or vote for it with remedial amendments, if we displace its consideration as the business before the Senate until it has been disposed of one way or another.

I may differ with my colleagues to some extent as to how the pending bill should be disposed of, but I can not see that there should be any difference between us as to the importance of disposing of it immediately. A vote to take up some other measure can mean but one thing, and that is that the other measure is of more vital importance than the railroad bill. It means that if we consider that line of procedure we may not get through with this legislation until the first day of January arrives.

Mr. KIRBY. Mr. President, I see no special reason for not displacing the railroad bill at this time. It is admitted by all that the bill proposed to be considered is of vital concern to the people of the country. Everybody seems to understand that about \$800,000,000 might be saved to the consumers of sugar in the United States by the passage of the bill. Almost everyone recognizes the necessity for something of the kind being done.

I do not see any reason why the sugar bill could not be passed in two hours. There is no reason, as it appears to me, why it could not be done. It would not delay the consideration of the railroad bill for any considerable time, and I believe we ought to take up the sugar bill and dispose of it.

As to the suggestion for meeting here at night, I do not think it is a wise one, and I do not think it should obtain. Why are Senators not in the Senate here to-day? It is said that there have been calls for a quorum many times to-day, and that is true. Many times a quorum has been called to-day. Senators are not in the Senate to-day and have not been, and why? Because they are tired, because they are worn out, because they have been here five or six months constantly. That is the condition of Senators to-day.

So far as criticism about a quorum is concerned, it may be just, but on the last quorum call there were present 600 per cent more Democratic Senators than there were Republican Senators, though that is not saying much, because there were present only six Democrats and the Republican making the speech.

That is the condition. If we shall come here and assume to transact business of this importance at night, Senators will not be here and the matter will not have proper consideration. It will not be done; and it ought not to be expected of men under the conditions I have outlined.

Let us pass the sugar bill in two hours, or a day, if necessary. The other matter is of vital importance; it is the most important matter that is before the American people, or will be before the American people for some time to come, after the ratification of the peace treaty. I do not know whether or not the treaty is expected to be again presented for consideration. The disposition of the railroad problem is the most important question thereafter, but it will take some time to adjust it. We ought to give the amount of time which is requisite to be given to it. The sugar question does not need much discussion; it can be disposed of in two hours. I believe the sugar bill ought to displace the pending measure, and that we should consider and pass it at once.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President, the Senator from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] has undertaken to read the Republican side of the Senate a lecture this afternoon with reference to the so-called sugar bill. No one knows better than does the Senator from Alabama that if the pending measure is displaced for the sugar bill, the sugar bill will be passed this afternoon, unless votes upon the Democratic side of the aisle are against it or debate upon that side of the aisle develops into a filibuster and prevents the passage of the bill.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from Alabama?

Mr. LENROOT. I yield.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I object to the Senator putting a prediction in my mouth. I do not know anything of the kind. If the Senator wants to make that prediction, let him make it as his own.

Mr. LENROOT. I think, Mr. President, the Record will show that the Senator from Alabama stated that if the pending bill were displaced, a great deal of time would be occupied in the consideration of the sugar bill.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I think it will, but I do not know. I can not predict who will occupy the time. I never have done so.

Mr. LENROOT. No; but while the Senator from Alabama is attempting to lecture this side of the aisle, I think he knows the time that will be occupied in debating the sugar bill will be on his side of the aisle and not upon this.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I do not know any such thing.

Mr. LENROOT. If that is not true, if the pending bill is displaced, the sugar bill will be passed before 6 o'clock to-night; and I suggest to the Senator from Alabama, if the pending bill is displaced, that he use his influence with the Members of his own party to expedite the consideration of the sugar bill.

Mr. President, the Senator from Alabama has undertaken a general lecture of the Republican side with reference to the legislation that has failed to pass. The Senator from Alabama seems to have forgotten that since the Republicans came into a majority in Congress the telegraph and telephones, which were taken under a Democratic administration, have been returned to their owners; he seems to have forgotten that the food-control act has been largely extended in accordance with the request of the President and that severe penalties have been provided for its violation; and I might go on and name other legislation which has been enacted since the majority passed to this side.

It is true, as the Senator from Alabama has said, that the consideration of the peace treaty during the long time that it was before the Senate did prevent the consideration of other important public measures. The Senator from Alabama, however, did not say what the fact is, that the responsibility for the lengthy consideration of that treaty and the fact that it is not ratified to-day belongs not to the Republican side of the Senate but to the Democratic side of the Senate. While I know that that subject, Mr. President, is one of which we are all tired, I think this is an opportune time to place upon the record just what the status of that matter is and where the responsibility lies.

A great propaganda is now going on over the country backed by certain forces attempting to lay the blame for the present status of the peace treaty upon the Republican side. Nearly every Senator on the other side of the aisle knows that the blame does not lie here, but lies with the Democratic side and with the President of the United States. The Senator from Alabama knows, I am sure—

Mr. UNDERWOOD. He does not know that. If the Senator from Wisconsin wants to make that prediction I am perfectly willing for him to do so, and to make it as his own; but I can not allow the Senator to continue to say that I know what he says is so—and I do not want to interrupt his speech—when I do not know it, and I repudiate the statement that the Senator is attempting to make in my name.

Mr. LENROOT. I, perhaps, should change that, but I have known the Senator from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] for many years, and I esteem him so highly, and he is so very intelligent, that I rather took it for granted that he knew these facts. [Laughter in the galleries.]

The VICE PRESIDENT. The doorkeepers will eject from the galleries persons who are violating the rules of the Senate.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I wish to assure the Senator from Wisconsin, with whom I have been associated for many years, that my intelligence runs along a different line from his on that subject.

Mr. LENROOT. Well, mine does not run in a groove made for me by the President of the United States.

Mr. President, as I said a moment ago, I think it is proper at this time, in view of what has been said, to place upon the record a little of the history of the closing days of the last session with respect to this matter. When this side of the aisle is criticized, and the responsibility is being attempted to be placed upon this side for the present status of the treaty, I want to make the statement that this side of the aisle made plain the basis upon which it was willing to ratify the treaty; and repeatedly, until the vote was taken, we attempted to get Senators on the other side of the aisle to make a proposition upon which they were willing to ratify the treaty. That proposal was repeatedly made to the Senator from Nebraska [Mr.

HITCHCOCK]. We adjourned on Wednesday night, November 19, and on the preceding Tuesday morning the Senator from Nebraska was asked to make such a proposition to the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], but he informed the Senator from Massachusetts that afternoon that he could not do so, presumably because he had not an opportunity to consult the President of the United States; presumably because the Senators upon the other side of the aisle were not willing to act upon their own responsibility, but intended to follow whatever suggestions the President might make. Until the last vote was taken the Senator from Nebraska knew that if his side had any proposition to make for the settlement of the matter then pending it would be welcomed and considered by this side of the aisle. He refused to make any, and he has not made any up to this date. Until, of course, the other side of the aisle, which had sufficient votes to defeat the ratification of the treaty, make some proposition there is no way by which the matter can be revived and the treaty ratified with proper reservations.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President, I do not wish to delay the Senate on this subject, but I want to repeat not as an argument, not as a lecture, but as a fact, that the Republican Party in this session of the Senate has not passed any important remedial legislation. The bill which took over the telegraph lines and placed them under the control of the Government itself provided that they should be returned as soon as the war was over. There was no contest about their return—if there had been, the bill would probably still be pending—and there really was no legislation necessary. The other bill to which the Senator has referred was in like category.

It is true that a large portion of the time was taken up in discussion of the treaty of peace, but not by any means all of it, for the treaty of peace came before the Senate and went to the committee in May. I am not sure about the date, but my recollection is that it was reported back and not taken up for consideration by the Senate until July. If I am wrong about that, I hope some Senator will correct me. There was certainly from May to July when there was nothing that stood in the way of remedial legislation being enacted.

Mr. LODGE. If the Senator will allow me, the treaty of peace was not presented here until the 10th day of July.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Then it was in the committee more than two months.

Mr. LODGE. The committee took it up and acted upon it after it had been presented by the President, on the 10th day of July, and printed.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. At what time was it reported back to the Senate?

Mr. LODGE. It was reported back to the Senate on the 4th day of September.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. That is the point that I have in mind, and I am glad the Senator corrected me. From the time Congress met, in May, until the 4th day of September of this year the treaty of peace was not before the Senate, and so the Senate had full and unlimited opportunity to pass remedial legislation concerning other matters. The treaty of peace did not interfere with that at all.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a moment?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Certainly.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Does the Senator forget all the appropriation bills?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. The appropriation bills did not take very much time on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I think the Senator will find that some of them did take considerable time, and furthermore that their initiation was delayed owing to the failure to summon the Congress at an earlier date.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. They did not have to get through Congress until the 1st of July; and, as I chanced to be on the Appropriations Committee, I happen to know that the reenactment of the bills that failed on account of a filibuster—and that probably includes all of them; it does include all of them—

Mr. LODGE. Oh, Mr. President, the sundry civil bill was not in the Senate in time to be passed.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. It failed on account of the filibuster being conducted on another measure.

Mr. LODGE. No; it did not fail on account of the filibuster; it failed because the House did not send it here.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I have seen sundry civil bills reported and acted upon in the Senate within two days after they came here, and a day or so before final adjournment; and we could have reported the sundry civil bill at the last session and it could have been passed, as sundry civil bills and other bills have been passed heretofore, within the time that was left.

Mr. WADSWORTH. It could not be passed until it reached the Senate.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. It was in the Senate; but the committee did not report it.

Mr. LODGE. It was not in the Senate.

Mr. WADSWORTH. It was not sent over from the House.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. The sundry civil bill was in the Senate, if Senators will allow me to say so.

Mr. LODGE. I think the Senator is mistaken.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I am sure the Senator thinks I am mistaken, but I happen to know that the bill did come over here before final adjournment.

Mr. LODGE. It may have come here, but it was not laid before the Senate.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. We could not lay it before the Senate because the appropriation bill which was before the Senate was the general deficiency bill, and it was being filibustered to death.

Mr. LODGE. What happened to the Army bill and to the Navy bill?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. They could not come up because the general deficiency bill was being filibustered to death, and we could not bring them up.

Mr. LODGE. When was the general deficiency bill brought in by the committee? It was brought in within 48 hours of final adjournment.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. The general deficiency bill?

Mr. LODGE. Yes.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. The Senator is mistaken.

Mr. LODGE. I am not mistaken about that.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I happened to be in charge of that bill myself, and I sat here all one night trying to get it through.

Mr. LODGE. If the Senator will look at the RECORD as to when it was brought into the Senate, he will find that it was brought in within 48 hours of final adjournment.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. The Senator is mistaken about the time when it was brought before the Senate. On account of illness, the chairman of the committee asked me to take charge of the bill, so that I was in charge of it myself, and I happen to know how long I sat here trying to get it through.

Mr. THOMAS. The Senator was in nominal charge.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I was in nominal charge; I stand corrected.

Mr. President, I wish to say in regard to the peace treaty that the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROO] is trying to put the blame of the failure of the treaty of peace on this side of the Chamber. He can not do that; he never will be able to do that; the country is never going to recognize that argument. If you want to get rid of the responsibility for failing to ratify the treaty of peace, it is, parliamentarily speaking, lying on the Vice President's table; the majority can take it up and consider it, and you have the majority. If you want to pass it, take it up and keep on trying to pass it until you get a two-thirds vote. As I have said, you can not get away from the responsibility for the failure of the treaty, as is evidenced by the concrete fact that you kept the treaty in the committee for months and you kept it before the Senate for months; but on the final passage of the resolution of ratification which you proposed you were unable at any time to command the votes of a majority of the Senate. That was the case.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, will the Senator allow me to make one slight correction?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. To be sure.

Mr. LODGE. The treaty is not before us. It can not be taken up. The Senate has overruled, no less than three times, the proposition that the Senator has put forth; and the Senator ought to know that it contravenes every precedent, every principle of parliamentary law, and the rules.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Of course, that is a difference of point of view between myself and the Senator.

Mr. LODGE. The Senate has three times decided the other way.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. If the Senator will listen to me a moment, I know the Senator stated that on the floor the last time his resolution with reservations was voted on. He stated that if it was rejected the treaty would be defeated, and the Senate had conformed to that order of business, notwithstanding the Vice President had ruled the other way and had been overruled by the Senate. But after the happening of that event I proposed a resolution of unrestricted ratification. There was no point of order made against it. No objection was made to it. It was voted on, and the Senator from Massachusetts himself moved to reconsider my motion and lay it on the table.

Well, now, what was disposed of? My motion was disposed of, but not the treaty. The treaty is now just exactly where it was when the Senator moved to lay my motion on the table. That is the parliamentary situation.

I know perfectly well that as long as a majority of the Senate, a majority on that side, intend to say that the treaty of peace is dead, it is dead temporarily, because nobody can do anything with it. As long as that side of the Chamber continues to say that the treaty is dead on the table of the President of the Senate, it is dead, because the majority will not take it up; but if there was a majority that was supporting myself or the Senator from Massachusetts, and we desired to resurrect the life of the treaty, we could very quickly do it with that majority—I mean as soon as debate ran out.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, it would be none the less out of order; but, if the Senator will allow me, he knows perfectly well, as well as I do, that the President can withdraw the treaty under the rules of the Senate without the permission of the Senate and resubmit it the same day, and then it is open.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I also know just as well as the Senator does, and he knows, that if the treaty is dead the Senate can send it back to the President and tell him it is dead; but the Senator can not get a majority to reach that conclusion, in my judgment. I think that would be the proper thing to do, from the Senator's standpoint. If the treaty is rejected by the Senate, it is up to the majority of the Senate to notify the President of the United States of the fact, which has not been done, and I think it has not been done because I think the Senator from Massachusetts doubts his ability to command a majority in this body to give that notification to the President.

Mr. LODGE. Oh, no; the Senator is mistaken. Occasionally the President has been notified of adverse action by the Senate on a treaty; sometimes he has not been; but in the last case, the case of the Chamberlain-Bayard treaty, that matter was brought up and it was decided by the Senate that no such order was necessary.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President, while we are on that subject—we have wandered far afield from what I was talking about—I want to say this:

I recognize the fact that the President could withdraw this treaty and send it back if he wanted to; but why should he? He sent it to the Senate. The Senate has it. It was on the desk of the Presiding Officer when we came out of executive session. It is there now, and a majority can go into executive session and move a vote of ratification, which, according to the original rulings of the Presiding Officer of this body, would be in order. The Senate adopted another rule. If the Presiding Officer followed the rule of the Senate, and not his own construction of parliamentary law, that majority could overrule him again, as they overruled him in the beginning, when I think he was right, and then the Senate could take up the treaty and act on it; and the only reason why it does not act on it is because it can not command a majority vote to act on it, or the majority does not want to act on it.

It seems to me it would be perfectly idle for the President of the United States to withdraw the treaty and send it back here when the Senate itself has indicated that it does not propose to act on the treaty; and if it is dead, it is not dead by my vote. I voted for its unconditional ratification. It is no more dead by my vote that did not command a majority vote than it is dead by the votes of the men who voted for the Lodge resolution that did not command a majority vote. I say it is the duty of the majority side of the Senate, where the responsibility lies, to try to work out some understanding between themselves and this side of the Chamber and the President of the United States by which a treaty of peace can be confirmed and a peace status established in the United States. You have not done it. I did not rise here to criticize you for not doing it, but it is a fact. It is a condition, not a theory. What I do say is that now you come to the second important piece of legislative work that has come before the Senate at this session, the handling of this great railroad bill, and a motion comes from your side of the Chamber to displace it. Now, if you are not going to attend to the business of the country, I say the country should understand it.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, there may not be very many Senators in the Chamber, but there are some who get a vast amount of consolation out of this discussion of the dead treaty; and if you can not find anyone at all who will assume the responsibility for its death, I think I can. I trust sincerely that it is dead and that it will stay dead. It is the best thing that the Senate has done since it has been in session or for many years, and if it does nothing else except to kill the treaty it will be entitled to the gratitude of the American people for all time to come.

Mr. President, the treaty has passed from the consideration of the Senate to the consideration of the people at large. The politicians who gather in Washington may debate behind closed doors as to whether or not they will make it an issue, but they will have no more effect upon whether or not it shall be an issue than they will have upon what time the sun shall rise tomorrow morning. The American people have a way of assuming jurisdiction and of retaining jurisdiction until they render final judgment, and this question has gone to the jurisdiction of the American people and it will be definitely and finally settled by them in the election of 1920. It does not make any difference how we vote here in the meantime or what proceedings we may have; this question is now in the minds of the masses of the American people and you can not eliminate it, and neither the timid members of my party nor the same kind of members of your party will have the slightest effect in the way of keeping it from the determination of the American people. It is, as has been said, to be an American question, and when you get an American question before the American people the American people will retain it and decide it for themselves. When they enter the election booth they will consider alone the independence of our country and the welfare of our people; they will not be feeling around to see how or where the majority opinion rests.

If there is anything that is eating out the heart of the two old parties in this country to-day it is the lack of moral courage to take hold of these questions and to declare themselves upon them. The political guides are faltering and trimming and seeking to step from under, but the people at large will decide the question according to national interests and national welfare. They will assume a responsibility from which the time-serving politician seeks to escape.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President, just a word in reply to the Senator from Alabama.

In spite of anything the Senator from Alabama may say, the record stands that a majority of the Senate of the United States adopted certain reservations to this treaty. It was then rejected by the votes of the alleged friends of the treaty or it would have been ratified. Now, until these alleged friends present some proposition for consideration by the friends of the treaty upon this side of the aisle, of course nothing can be done. So the responsibility lies with the friends of the treaty, who killed it.

Now, just a word with reference to what the Senator from Alabama said concerning the time wasted by the Senate of the United States in May and June of this year.

The Senator from Alabama seems to have forgotten that during those two or three months the Senate of the United States was occupied in the consideration of the appropriation bills which failed at the last session; and this Republican Congress in passing the appropriation bills reduced them by \$939,692,541.07 over the same bills passed by the last Democratic Congress. That is fairly good work, I think, Mr. President—the Republican Congress saving money to the people of the United States at the rate of about \$400,000,000 a month. Possibly the Senator from Alabama may sneer at a little item of nearly a billion dollars, but the taxpayers think something of a matter of that importance.

Now, just a word with reference to this motion.

I do not believe the railroads of this country should be returned until next spring. I do not believe they should be returned to their owners at the highest period of cost of operation and the lowest period of revenue. The Senator from Alabama says that the President says that they will be returned on the 1st of January. Well, Mr. President, possibly autocracy has gotten so far in this country that when Cæsar speaks he can no longer change his mind; but I can not assume that the President of the United States, when the House has passed a bill returning the roads to their owners and when the Senate is engaged in the consideration of such a bill, is going to return them on the 1st of January. If he does, and the railroads are forced into bankruptcy, the responsibility will not lie with the Republican Congress, but will lie with the President of the United States.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, now that the buck has been passed and repassed I suggest a vote upon the motion.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, at the time I made the motion to consider what is known as the sugar bill I was conscious of the importance of the railroad legislation before the Senate. However, I do not believe that by displacing it for the afternoon any considerable time will be lost. It is not necessary for me to undertake to describe the sugar situation or the importance of early railroad legislation; but, Mr. President, a large part of this day has been destroyed, the last hour and a half by political debate. If we had talked less politics and more sugar,

I think we would have had this bill passed by this hour; and if we would take up the consideration of the sugar bill at this hour I have every confidence that we could pass it by 6 o'clock. I wish Senators would bear that in mind. I would gladly defer action until this evening if I thought it were possible to have a quorum present, but I do not think so, and in that view I sincerely hope that the majority will be found supporting the motion which has been made.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is upon the motion of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNary] to proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 3284.

Mr. CUMMINS. I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. No business has intervened since there was a quorum call, and the Chair will not entertain a call for a quorum when debate only has intervened. It has been the universal ruling of every Presiding Officer who ever occupied this chair, and on appeals from the rulings of the Presiding Officer the ruling has been sustained that debate is not the discharge of business. The Chair takes cognizance of the fact that no business has been transacted since the last quorum call and refuses to call for a quorum.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. That is the situation, then, that there has been no business?

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is the situation.

Mr. CUMMINS. I have asked for the yeas and nays on the motion of the Senator from Oregon.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Mr. President, I want to vote intelligently on this matter, and I have not a very clear idea of the situation. I want to say at the outset that I am in favor, wherever it is possible, of getting rid of the laws that invoke the interference of the Government in the affairs of the American people, and I want to vote to that end whenever I get a chance. I do not understand this situation, and I would like to ask the Senator from Oregon, or some of those who have the information, some questions.

Does this necessity, or seeming necessity, for the interference of the Government, or for the continuation of the Board of Equalization, a part of whose powers I see by the bill are to be restricted, grow out of the fact that there is such a sugar shortage that the law of supply and demand will put the price of sugar beyond the reach of the ordinary individual, or does it arise from the fact that there may be enough sugar to go around, but that somebody is cornering the market? I would like to understand the situation before I vote.

Mr. McNary. Mr. President, I am sorry the Senator from South Carolina, who is usually in touch with public matters, has not given the sugar situation some consideration. The bill simply authorizes the Sugar Equalization Board, acting in its legislative capacity, to acquire raw sugars of the crop of 1921, if they can be obtained at a fair and reasonable price. The purpose of that is to enable the Government, acting under that agency, to go out and acquire the raw sugar crop in Cuba and elsewhere which is necessary to supply the American public with a normal quantity of sugar. Briefly, that is the purpose of the measure and the object which I think it will accomplish.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Does the Senator say it is to enable the board to purchase the foreign and domestic crop?

Mr. McNary. Yes.

Mr. GAY. Will the Senator from South Carolina yield?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from South Carolina yield to the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I do.

Mr. GAY. I merely would like to say that the president of the Sugar Equalization Board, Mr. Zabriskie, informed the Government that it is too late to have any kind of control that could be enforced. It is the opinion of the president of the equalization board, and it is the opinion of a great many people who are well posted, that if the policy of noninterference in business had been adopted by the Government some time ago there would not be the scarcity of sugar existing at this time, and there is no reason now why an adequate supply of sugar can not be obtained from Cuba in the usual manner that was followed prior to the war.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. The only matter that is concerning me now is that this is a time of peace, and we are about to establish a precedent here of the Government entering in to relieve a condition which it seems to me those who engage in merchandise in this country are perfectly competent to relieve. If somebody is buying this crop or taking advantage of the scarcity of sugar and cornering it, why was the Sherman anti-trust law written upon the statute books? Why have we gone and solemnly committed ourselves to the farce of trying to enact legislation which will deter the evil-minded from doing things,

and then, while it is on the statute books, invoking the Government to go into business in order to prevent the people themselves from coming in and running the business?

If I understand the condition, there is a scarcity of sugar, and for fear that somebody somewhere will corner the supply and put the price beyond what is thought reasonable, the Government must step in and assume the function of purchaser and of vendor to the people in order to keep the price within what they think are reasonable bounds.

If it was during the war and conditions were abnormal by virtue of that fact, it would be a different proposition; but for us to continue the Government in the practice of buying is with me a question of principle. I would infinitely rather see a commodity go to any kind of a price than for us to commit ourselves to the doctrine of socialism. That is what is the matter with us now. We are not only assuming to become a merchant but we are absolutely becoming the guardians of labor and of capital, telling capital how much it shall make upon an investment and labor how much it shall get when the capital is put into operation. I do not know what other steps the Government can take that will differentiate it from being the most pernicious form of paternalism and of socialism, interfering in every direction.

Such evils will necessarily come, but it is for the people themselves to settle this question. I would rather have the buyers and sellers of sugar settle this question amongst themselves, and if they find some one who is really trying to corner the market, hale him before the courts and let the world know, than for us to camouflage the situation by the Government buying and selling. Let us go back to a prewar status, and let people find out who it is that wants to sell sugar at 25 and 30 cents a pound.

I am informed that sugar is being sold in New York now at around 9½ and 10 cents a pound. Just the other day down in my South Carolina home I bought 160 pounds and gave 20 cents a pound for it, and the party who sold it to me asked me to put it in a sack and try to smuggle it out, for he did not know what would happen to him if it was found out that he sold me so much sugar. There was some kind of a rule or regulation about selling an individual that much sugar. I do not know but what I am liable to indictment now for getting 160 pounds of sugar, even though I paid 20 cents a pound for it.

Mr. President, in all seriousness, a man has to pinch himself to know whether he is in America or not, whether he is living under the Government that he thought he was living under or whether we are in distressed and disrupted Europe. Can we not trust the American people, who buy and sell in the markets? If there are scoundrels who take advantage of the situation we have a law to meet the case, and we ought to invoke it. I am opposed to any further Government interference, if there is any possibility of getting away from it, and it looks to me as if some one could ferret out and account for the present abnormal condition.

I do not know whether the alleged facts are true, but it was stated, I think, by the Senator from Idaho on the floor here the other day that vast quantities of sugar are being exported from this country. It was also alleged by another, as I stated a moment ago, that in one region they are selling sugar at about 10 cents a pound and in another region sugar at wholesale is bringing 18 and is being retailed at 20, 22, and 23 cents a pound, all right here in the same country. Is there no one who can understand and meet this condition without remedying it by the Government stepping in and becoming the shopkeeper for America, letting these persons understand that under the law against trusts and combinations they will be prosecuted? Let the people settle the question as to what they shall give and let the markets assume their normal course.

I predict that if we extend the life of this Sugar Equalization Board for one year more we shall have to extend its life another year, and, as has been intimated here by others, why not appoint an equalization board for beef and for the meats of this country? They are abnormally high. Shoes that cost \$6 before the war are now \$25 a pair.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from South Carolina yield to the Senator from Alabama?

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I do.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I would like to ask the Senator from South Carolina if he does not believe that all the high price of sugar about which he complains is the result of the so-called zone system?

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I think it is.

Mr. BANKHEAD. You are in what is known as the southern zone, or the New Orleans zone?

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. The 20-cents-a-pound zone.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Yes; the 20-cents-a-pound zone, and you are not permitted to buy any sugar in New York at 10 cents a pound.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. And carry it to my home.

Mr. BANKHEAD. And carry it to your zone.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. No.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Therefore, I presume the high price of Louisiana sugar is the result of the zone system, requiring others to buy the Louisiana sugar when Louisiana has not any sugar to sell.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I am beginning to get some light on this question.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Mr. President, I have an amendment which the Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNABY] has been good enough to say that he will accept, which provides for this very matter, to be added to the bill, as follows:

*Provided*, That zones in which certain kinds of sugar only may be sold shall not be established by the said equalization board and that prices of foreign, Louisiana, and beet sugar, and the other various grades of sugar, shall be equal and uniform for each grade throughout the United States and to all the citizens thereof, and that sugar may be bought in any part of the United States for distribution and use in any other portion of the United States.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Can you not amend that by repealing the zones?

Mr. MCKELLAR. This repeals the zone system, because there is nothing in the law that provides for it. This prohibits the zone system, and I am sure will have the effect desired by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH]. The Senator from Oregon has already announced his willingness to accept it.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. May I ask the Senator from Tennessee if that should pass, what would be the necessity of extending the life of the board to look after the matter?

Mr. MCKELLAR. As I understand it, it is that our principal source of supply is Cuba, and the Cuban planters have offered to sell to the equalization board in bulk at a price, I believe, of 10½ cents a pound, so that it will guarantee, if the equalization board is directed to buy and does buy the crop of Cuban sugar, as it is believed it can buy it, the American people will be certain that during the ensuing year they will not have to pay more than 12 cents a pound at the outside for sugar.

Mr. RANSDELL. Will the Senator from South Carolina allow me to correct an error into which the Senator from Tennessee inadvertently has entered?

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Certainly.

Mr. RANSDELL. The people of Cuba have not agreed to any such price as that. Some time ago they did offer to sell their sugar in bulk, but they specifically withdrew their proposition to sell.

Mr. MCKELLAR. They offered to sell some time ago.

Mr. RANSDELL. Several months ago; but they withdrew that proposition. So we do not know that we could buy it now if we had the money and were authorized to buy it.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Does not the Senator from Louisiana think that we ought to try to buy it? Does he not think we ought to save this enormous amount of money to the users of sugar in this country? Does not the Senator think we ought to undertake in some way to prevent this enormous loss to the American people?

Mr. RANSDELL. So far as I am concerned, I would be entirely willing to pass a law authorizing our equalization board to attempt to purchase from Cuba, but this proposed bill says "purchase from America." The bill proposes to interfere with the business of Louisiana, of the beet-sugar people, the Hawaiian people, and the Porto Rican people. If they will also interfere with the selling of butter and eggs in your State, and the selling of meats in other places, and hard and flour and meal and every commodity on earth, so that all the laws of supply and demand in America are interfered with, and we are not allowed to do business in the orderly way in which we have always done it, then I say I will make no objection to sugar; but as long as I have breath in me I will stand here and oppose sugar being singled out for this absolute and complete violation of all law that we knew in this country prior to the Great War, which caused us to do away with law.

Mr. MCKELLAR. If I may have the permission of the Senator from South Carolina to answer the statement made by the Senator from Louisiana—

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Certainly.

Mr. MCKELLAR. I will say that whenever the butter and egg people sell their butter and eggs at one price to a part of the people of the United States, and whenever the beef people sell their beef at one price to a portion of the people of the United States, and in another zone increase that price from 50

to 100 per cent, we had better regulate the butter and egg people and the beef people, too. That is what government is for.

We are paying in the Tennessee district from which I come almost double the price for sugar that people are paying in this District. It is an outrage upon the American people. It is an outrage upon the people of Tennessee that they are required to pay almost double the price for sugar that the people are paying in other States.

Mr. RANSDELL. Will the Senator permit a question?

Mr. MCKELLAR. I will stay here quite as long to protect the interests of Tennessee that are being exploited for the benefit of somebody as the Senator from Louisiana will stand by the people of his State.

Mr. RANSDELL. Will the Senator from South Carolina allow me to ask the Senator from Tennessee a question?

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Certainly.

Mr. MCKELLAR. I shall be delighted to answer the question if I can.

Mr. RANSDELL. I ask the Senator from Tennessee if he does not think the whole trouble might be righted if the authority which created the zones could be annulled? The whole trouble comes from the Sugar Equalization Board creating a series of zones. In one zone, the zone along the North Atlantic coast, it is selling the remnant of last year's Cuban sugar crop at around 9 cents to the wholesaler. It has created another zone where the beet-sugar people are not permitted to sell, as I understand it, at over 10½ cents a pound. Then it has created another zone in which the Louisiana people are permitted to sell, not at a price fixed by the equalization board but at a price which the Attorney General says will not be profiteering, to wit, 17 to 18 cents a pound.

Mr. MCKELLAR. I am unwilling for that to be done.

Mr. RANSDELL. I care nothing for it as a Louisianian. I do not ask for that. I will join the Senator from Tennessee this minute in repealing any authority which the equalization board has to fix zones. I want my people in Louisiana to stand absolutely on the laws of supply and demand, and that is all they ask. They want to be let alone. We will be glad to have you let us alone. That is all any American citizen ought to ask. But in God's name do not pass a law here saying that some governmental agency in times of peace like these shall go down to Louisiana and tell those people that they must sell their sugar, shall go to Hawaii and tell those people they must sell their sugar, shall go to Porto Rico and tell those people they must sell their sugar, shall go to the sugar-beet States and tell those people they must sell their sugar.

I say that if you are going to break up the rules and regulations of all the decent respectable business, if you are going to destroy the democratic ideas under which this Government has so long thriven, you should not limit it to sugar. Apply it to everything. Apply it, as the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] said, to shoes and to meat and to everything else. Let us have fair play now. Louisiana, I repeat, asks no favoritism whatsoever—absolutely none.

Destroy the zone-creating authority, and you will get rid of that trouble. If the zone-creating authority were out of office, then you could go into New York and buy sugar and carry it down to Tennessee. Then you could go into the sugar-beet States and buy sugar and carry it to Tennessee; and if Louisiana could not meet the competition of the sugar-beet people and the New York refiners, then she could not sell her sugar. That is all there is to it.

Destroy that war authority. We had lots of authority during the war, and most of it, thank God, has gone out of existence. Here is one, however, functioning yet to some extent and creating all sorts of inequalities. Do not get it into your head that anybody in Louisiana wants you to be compelled to buy in Louisiana. We want you to have authority to buy anywhere on earth you can buy. At the same time we in Louisiana wish to be authorized to sell to anybody who will buy our goods and not be limited to selling to the United States Government.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I have just a few more words to say and then I am through. I am glad that I started this discussion, because it has led me to see possibly the cause of the present discriminatory prices.

The arbitrary fixing of zones by this board has given certain individuals, it appears, a monopoly of a certain region. It has shut out competition. I am perfectly willing now, if that is a fair understanding of the question, to have it definitely understood by the legislation that we may pass this afternoon that America is the zone for the sale of sugar—not any particular part for any particular source of supply, but that America is the zone where this equalization board shall function for the

purpose, under this emergency, of getting in as much outside sugar as they can.

In conclusion I will merely say that I hope that we will all have enough sugar for Christmas under any circumstances.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNary] to proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 3284. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JONES of Washington (when his name was called). The senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. Swanson] is necessarily absent in Virginia on account of illness in his family. I have a pair with that Senator during his absence and therefore withhold my vote.

Mr. KNOX (when his name was called). I am paired with the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. Chamberlain]. In his absence I withhold my vote.

Mr. LODGE (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. Smith]. I transfer that pair to the junior Senator from Maryland [Mr. France] and vote "nay."

Mr. THOMAS (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. Gronna] which I transfer to the senior Senator from California [Mr. Phelan] and vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. MYERS. Has the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McLean] voted?

The VICE PRESIDENT. He has not.

Mr. MYERS. I have a pair with the Senator from Connecticut, which I transfer to the Senator from Nevada [Mr. Pittman] and vote "nay."

Mr. WILLIAMS. I have a pair with the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Penrose]. I transfer that pair to the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. Gerry] and vote "nay."

Mr. REED. I transfer my pair with the Senator from Michigan [Mr. Newberry] to the Senator from Arizona [Mr. Smith] and vote "nay."

Mr. FALL. I have a pair with the junior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. Kendrick] and, in his absence, withhold my vote.

Mr. WATSON (after having voted in the negative). I transfer my pair with the Senator from Delaware [Mr. Wolcott] to the Senator from Illinois [Mr. Sherman] and will permit my vote to stand.

Mr. CURTIS. I have been requested to announce the following pairs:

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. Dillingham] with the Senator from Maryland [Mr. Smith];

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. Edge] with the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. Owen];

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. Townsend] with the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. Robinson]; and

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. McCormick] with the Senator from Nevada [Mr. Henderson].

Mr. McKellar. I wish to announce that the Senator from Oregon [Mr. Chamberlain], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Shields], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. Smith] are absent on official business.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I have been requested to announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. Swanson] and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. Pittman] are detained from the Senate by illness in their families.

The Senator from Virginia is paired with the Senator from Washington [Mr. Jones].

The result was announced—yeas 27, nays 33, as follows:

YEAS—27.

Ball	Johnson, S. Dak.	McNary	Simmons
Borah	Jones, N. Mex.	Nelson	Spencer
Capper	Keyes	New	Sterling
Frelinghuysen	King	Norris	Sutherland
Gronna	Kirby	Nugent	Trammell
Harris	Lenroot	Overman	Walsh, Mass.
Harrison	McKellar	Sheppard	

NAYS—33.

Ashurst	Fernald	Myers	Underwood
Bankhead	Fletcher	Page	Wadsworth
Beckham	Gay	Pomerene	Walsh, Mont.
Brandegee	Hale	Ransdell	Warren
Calder	Harding	Reed	Watson
Colt	Hitchcock	Smith, S. C.	Williams
Cummins	Kellogg	Smoot	
Dial	Lodge	Stanley	
Elkins	Moses	Thomas	

NOT VOTING—35.

Chamberlain	Fall	Johnson, Calif.	La Follette
Culberson	France	Jones, Wash.	McCormick
Curtis	Gerry	Kendrick	McCumber
Dillingham	Gore	Kenyon	McLean
Edge	Henderson	Knox	Newberry

Owen	Pittman	Shields	Swanson
Penrose	Polindexter	Smith, Ariz.	Townsend
Phelan	Robinson	Smith, Ga.	Wolcott
Phipps	Sherman	Smith, Md.	

So Mr. McNary's motion was rejected.

Mr. McKellar. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent at this time to offer the amendment to the McNary bill that I read only a few moments ago.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. GAY. I object, Mr. President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. There is objection.

Mr. GAY. I call for the regular order.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, if I am not mistaken, the question that is now pending is upon the amendment proposed by the Senator from Montana [Mr. Myers]. I have already twice discussed the amendment, but there are many Senators present who were not present during the discussion of either the Senator from Montana or myself. I do not intend to repeat what I have said, but simply to call attention to the character of the amendment.

The Senator from Montana proposes to strike from the bill those provisions which require the presence on the board of directors of railway companies organized or reorganized under this proposed act of two representatives of the employees and two representatives of the Government. The view of the committee is that we have done the best we can to avoid differences of opinion, to promote harmony and good feeling. With that suggestion, so far as I am concerned, I am quite willing to have a vote upon the amendment.

[Mr. McKellar addressed the Senate. After having spoken, with interruptions, for about one hour, he yielded the floor for the day.]

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. CUMMINS. I move that the Senate adjourn until 11 o'clock to-morrow morning.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I ask the Senator if he will not allow us to have a very short executive session?

Mr. CUMMINS. Certainly.

Mr. GAY. As a substitute, Mr. President, I move that the Senate take a recess until that hour.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Will the Senator withhold the motion so that we may have an executive session? I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After five minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate adjourn until 11 o'clock to-morrow morning.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 35 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Friday, December 12, 1919, at 11 o'clock a. m.

NOMINATIONS.

*Executive nominations received by the Senate December 11 (legislative day of Wednesday, December 10), 1919.*

SECRETARIES OF EMBASSIES OR LEGATIONS.

CLASS 3 TO CLASS 2.

The following-named person for promotion in the Diplomatic Service of the United States: Alexander C. Kirk, of Illinois, secretary of embassy or legation.

The following-named person for promotion in the Diplomatic Service of the United States: Frederic R. Dolbeare, of New York, secretary of embassy or legation.

The following-named person for promotion in the Diplomatic Service of the United States: Eugene C. Shoecraft, of Missouri, secretary of embassy or legation.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS.

John Pallace, of Brockport, N. Y., to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 8, with headquarters at Rochester, N. Y., to fill an existing vacancy.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY.

Isaac Blair Evans, of Salt Lake City, Utah, to be United States attorney, district of Utah, vice William W. Ray, resigned, effective January 1, 1920.

UNITED STATES MARSHAL.

Claude Bond, of Toccoa, Ga., to be United States marshal, northern district of Georgia, vice Howard Thompson, whose term has expired.

## RECEIVER OF PUBLIC MONEYS.

Julius B. Alvord, of California, to be receiver of public moneys at Susanville, Calif., his present term expiring December 16, 1919. Reappointment.

## PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR ARMY.

## COAST ARTILLERY CORPS.

*To be colonel.*

Lieut. Col. John C. Gilmore, jr., Coast Artillery Corps, from December 7, 1919.

## FIELD ARTILLERY.

*To be captain.*

First Lieut. Frank Langham, Field Artillery, from September 1, 1919.

## PROMOTIONS AND APPOINTMENTS IN THE NAVY.

Lieut. Leman L. Babbitt to be a lieutenant commander in the Navy, for temporary service, from the 1st day of July, 1919.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Clarence E. Miller to be a lieutenant in the Navy, for temporary service, from the 1st day of November, 1919.

The following-named ensigns to be lieutenants (junior grade) in the Navy, for temporary service, from the 1st day of July, 1919:

Walter F. H. Nolte,  
Anthony Feher,  
Wallace Cooper,  
James F. Jeter,  
Warren A. Sprout, and  
Scott E. Peck.

Machinist Homer N. Wilkinson to be an ensign in the Navy, for temporary service, from the 1st day of September, 1919.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Frederick D. W. Baldwin, United States Naval Reserve Force, to be an ensign in the Navy, for temporary service, from the 1st day of September, 1919.

Medical Inspector Archibald M. Fauntleroy to be a medical director in the Navy, with the rank of captain, for temporary service, from the 5th day of October, 1919.

The following-named acting pay clerks to be assistant paymasters in the Navy, with the rank of ensign, for temporary service, from the 1st day of September, 1919:

George H. Williams and  
Joseph A. Hesse.

Pay Clerk Richard A. Vollbrecht to be an assistant paymaster in the Navy, with the rank of ensign, for temporary service, from the 1st day of September, 1919.

Ensign Edward B. Cantej (Pay Corps), United States Naval Reserve Force, to be an assistant paymaster in the Navy, with the rank of ensign, for temporary service, from the 1st day of September, 1919.

The following-named boatswains to be chief boatswains in the Navy, for temporary service, from the 1st day of September, 1919:

Walter H. Amberger and  
James E. Tracy.

The following-named gunners to be chief gunners in the Navy, for temporary service, from the 1st day of September, 1919:

Theodore Thompson,  
Morris E. Eason,  
Howard A. Booth, and  
Ernest R. Stephenson.

Machinist Harry W. Dreher to be a chief machinist in the Navy, for temporary service, from the 1st day of September, 1919.

The following-named carpenters to be chief carpenters in the Navy, for temporary service, from the 1st day of September, 1919:

Paul W. Reeves,  
Arthur E. Lawrence, and  
Eugene F. Smith.

Pharmacist Frank A. Northrup to be a chief pharmacist in the Navy, for temporary service, from the 1st day of September, 1919.

Acting Pay Clerk Thomas E. Harris to be a chief pay clerk in the Navy, for temporary service, from the 1st day of September, 1919.

The following-named lieutenants to be lieutenant commanders in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1919:

Warren G. Child,  
Harry Campbell,  
Charles W. Crosse,  
Alfred W. Atkins,  
Bruce R. Ware, jr.,

Richard E. Cassidy, and  
Joseph Baer.

Lieut. Francis A. L. Vossler to be a lieutenant commander in the Navy from the 12th day of July, 1919.

Lieut. Schuyler F. Helm to be a lieutenant commander in the Navy from the 27th day of August, 1919.

The following-named lieutenants (junior grade) to be lieutenants in the Navy from the 8th day of June, 1918:

Edward P. Nickinson, and  
Charles P. Mason.

Lieut. (junior grade) Harry P. Curley to be a lieutenant in the Navy from the 8th day of December, 1918.

The following-named lieutenants (junior grade) to be lieutenants in the Navy from the 7th day of June, 1919:

Ray H. Wakeman,  
William I. Causey, jr.,  
Hugh L. White,  
George D. Hull,  
Carl T. Hull,  
Terry B. Thompson,  
Charles J. Parrish,  
Thomas M. Shock,  
Frank L. Johnston,  
Herbert K. Fenn,  
Walter O. Henry,  
Wilbur J. Ruble,  
Justin McC. Miller, and  
Roy Pfaff.

Lieut. (junior grade) Walker Cochran to be a lieutenant in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1919.

Ensign Zeno W. Wicks to be a lieutenant (junior grade) in the Navy from the 6th day of June, 1917.

The following-named ensigns to be lieutenants (junior grade) in the Navy from the 5th day of June, 1918:

Marcus C. Miller, and  
John S. Farnsworth.

The following-named ensigns to be lieutenants (junior grade) in the Navy from the 3d day of June, 1919:

Robert C. Bourne,  
Earl M. Major,  
Milton O. Carlson,  
Harry V. Baugh,  
Henry L. Phelps,  
George P. Brewster,  
Homer L. Grosskopf,  
Bruce P. Flood,  
Gilbert W. Sumners,  
Albert M. Rhudy,  
William E. Miller,  
John S. Roberts,  
William W. Schott,  
Leon S. Fiske,  
Lyman K. Swenson,  
Paul S. Goen,  
Charles G. Halpine,  
John E. Reinburg,  
Robert B. Twining,  
Henry N. Fallon,  
Oscar W. Erickson,  
Henry C. Merwin,  
Calvin T. Durgin,  
William J. Forrestell,  
Norman O. Wynkoop,  
Joseph H. Lawson, and  
Walter S. Carrington.

The following-named assistant civil engineers for temporary service to be assistant civil engineers in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant (junior grade), from the 1st day of July, 1918, to correct the date from which they take rank as previously confirmed:

Fritz C. Nyland,  
Ira P. Griffin,  
Charles R. Johnson,  
Frank F. Addicks,  
Henry Brinkmeyer, jr.,  
John B. McTigue,  
Lewis Thornburg,  
Lewis N. Moeller,  
Carl F. Fritch,  
Carl N. Cotter,  
Louis B. Hyde, and  
Theron A. Hartung.

Assistant Civil Engineer Charles D. Riddle for temporary service, to be an assistant civil engineer in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant (junior grade), from the 1st day of July, 1918.

## CONFIRMATIONS.

*Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate December 11 (legislative day of Wednesday, December 10), 1919.*

## SECRETARY OF COMMERCE.

Joshua Willis Alexander to be Secretary of Commerce.

## COAST GUARD.

Capt. of Engineers Quincy Bogardus Newman to be engineer in chief of the Coast Guard.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

THURSDAY, December 11, 1919.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Lord God Almighty, ever susceptible to the needs of Thy children, let Thy spirit possess us to guide us through the changing scenes of this day that we may reflect Thy glory in whatsoever we put our hands to.

Finally, brethren, whatsoever things are true, whatsoever things are honest, whatsoever things are just, whatsoever things are pure, whatsoever things are lovely, whatsoever things are of good report, if there be any virtue, and if there be any praise, think on these things.

In the name and spirit of the Lord Jesus Christ. Amen.

## THE JOURNAL.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, before the Journal is approved I desire to call attention to a collocation of words in the Journal which to me seems wrong. In one place the Journal recites the fact that the Speaker "directed" the House to resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House. The Speaker does not direct the House. The Speaker resolves the House, and I think the Journal ought to make it appear in that way. Of course, it does not amount to very much, but I think we might as well have it right.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri has called the matter to the attention of the Clerk, and the Chair feels sure that the suggestion will be given the proper consideration. Without objection, the Journal of yesterday, as read, will be approved.

There was no objection.

## WILD BIRDS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 1199) to prohibit the purchase, sale, or possession for the purpose of sale of certain wild birds in the District of Columbia, with Senate amendments thereto, and agree to the Senate amendments.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan asks unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill H. R. 1199, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments. Is there objection?

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, what are the Senate amendments?

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Speaker, the bill was introduced by the gentleman's colleague [Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois] to prohibit the sale of certain game birds in the District of Columbia. As the bill was introduced and passed the House of Representatives and as it went to the Senate, it included, among others, certain migratory birds. The Department of Agriculture called attention to the fact that migratory birds were covered by the treaty applying to migratory birds, and asked to have them eliminated from the bill. The Senate, therefore, amended the bill by striking out all migratory birds that were embraced in the bill originally so that it would apply only to nonmigratory birds.

Mr. MADDEN. And that is all of the change there is?

Mr. MAPES. That is all of the change.

Mr. MADDEN. I have no objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk reported the title of the bill, and read the Senate amendments.

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House concur in the Senate amendments.

The motion was agreed to.

## MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Crockett, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed bill and joint resolution of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested.

S. 3187. An act to dispose of a certain strip of public land in Waterville, Me.; and

S. J. Res. 131. Joint resolution making immediately available the appropriation for the expenses of regulating further the entry of aliens into the United States.

## SESSIONS OF COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the District of Columbia have leave to sit tomorrow, Friday, December 12, 1919, during the session of the House, for the purpose of conducting hearings on the so-called half-and-half plan.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan asks unanimous consent that the District Committee be allowed to sit to-morrow during the session of the House. Is there objection? There was no objection.

## BUREAU OF COAST GUARD PATROL.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, I ask unanimous consent that the bill (H. R. 10404) to amend sections 4, 8, and 10 of the act of June 29, 1906, as amended, relating to naturalization, to provide for a division of patrol guard in the Bureau of Immigration, and for other purposes, together with the report thereon, be recommitted to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Washington asks unanimous consent that the bill H. R. 10404, which has been reported by the Committee on Naturalization and Immigration, together with the report thereon, be recommitted to that committee. Is there objection?

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, what is the object in recommitting this bill?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I would say that this bill is primarily a naturalization bill, an omnibus bill, which picks up many bills that have been introduced. There was added to it one feature, section 7, which is an immigration matter, which provides for the establishment of a division of patrol guards in that Bureau of Immigration in the Department of Labor, for the purpose of patrolling the coast and land boundaries of the United States. That is an immigration matter.

Mr. MADDEN. How much would that involve? How many people would that provide employment for?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I can not say. We undertake in that paragraph to make an authorization of \$250,000. The trouble with the matter is this. We have a partial coast patrol, paid for by the Immigration Service. We also have a coast guard, and the duties of the men in that service include the picking up of aliens who attempt to enter the United States surreptitiously.

Mr. GARNER. Why does the gentleman want to recommit this bill? I understand he wants to get that provision out of the bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Yes.

Mr. GARNER. The gentleman can offer an amendment when he takes the bill up for consideration in the House to strike out that provision, and that will obviate this request.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Let me go a little bit further. The first paragraph repeals the requirement for a certificate of arrival to be filed by the alien at the time he petitions for naturalization.

Mr. GARNER. Why can the gentleman not offer an amendment in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union and have it adopted by the committee, and in that way perfect his bill, and pass it as we do other bills. There is no necessity for recommitting this bill. If the gentleman wants to hasten this legislation, he can take it up to-day, amend his bill if he desires, and then pass the bill, and we will in that way have a chance to put you on record with respect to patrolling the border, and that is what I am going to do. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas objects.

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. HULINGS. Mr. Speaker, yesterday morning I asked unanimous consent to have printed in the Record a memorial from the oil producers engaged in business in Mexico. I see that that has been printed in the Record this morning in the Senate proceedings, so I shall not further take that matter up. I now ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record a memorial from the Elks Lodge of Sharon, Pa.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record by printing therein a memorial from the Elks Lodge of Sharon, Pa. Is there objection?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would suggest to the gentleman that similar

resolutions have been sent to nearly all Members. It is desirable to keep the size of the RECORD down, and therefore I object.

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by including therein a list of the personnel of the Navy during the war, a matter in which we are all interested. It is an official list. It is very short.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD in the manner indicated. Is there objection?

Mr. HULINGS. Mr. Speaker, I object.

PAYMENT OF SALARIES OF OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES OF CONGRESS FOR DECEMBER, 1919.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the following resolution.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Joint resolution authorizing the payment of salaries of officers and employees of Congress for December, 1919.

*Resolved, etc.* That the Secretary of the Senate and the Clerk of the House of Representatives are authorized and instructed to pay the officers and employees of the Senate and House of Representatives, including the Capitol police, their respective salaries for the month of December, 1919, on the day of adjournment of the present session for the holiday recess.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of this resolution?

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, does the gentleman understand that to include the payment of clerks to Members?

Mr. GOOD. They are on the salary roll, and it includes all officers and employees of the House, including the Capitol police, and it is the customary resolution that has always been passed at this season of the year.

Mr. CALDWELL. I wanted to be sure, because they are now on the roll.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, I want to ask the gentleman a question. The gentleman speaks of adjournment for the holiday recess. May I ask the gentleman upon what day the steering committee has decided upon such adjournment?

Mr. GOOD. I am not authorized—

Mr. BLANTON. So that we who did not get a chance to go home during the 10-day recess may yet get a chance to go there?

Mr. GOOD. I am not informed as to the exact time. I have heard some talk of December 20, but as to the exact day—

Mr. BLANTON. That would be Saturday of next week.

Mr. GOOD. As I understand.

Mr. BLANTON. I will ask the gentleman from Wyoming that question while I have the floor. Would the gentleman from Wyoming kindly give us light on that subject? What day may we expect the holiday adjournment?

Mr. HULINGS. Mr. Speaker, I call for the regular order.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, in due time I expect to offer a resolution for a holiday recess from December 20 until January 5.

Mr. BLANTON. That is sufficient.

The SPEAKER. The question is, Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the resolution? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOOD. I will yield.

Mr. WALSH. There was considerable confusion at the time the gentleman was making the statement. Do I understand this to be the usual resolution which is passed prior to taking a holiday recess for the compensation of employees of the House and Capitol—

Mr. GOOD. And the Senate; it is.

Mr. WALSH. And is in the usual form?

Mr. GOOD. In the usual form, except formerly the resolution provided for the payment of compensation to Members that went to them for clerk hire. Now the clerks have been placed on the roll and therefore there is a slight change in the phraseology, just to conform to the change in the statute.

Mr. BRAND. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOOD. I will.

Mr. BRAND. I wanted to know why the gentleman discriminates in the resolution between the officers and employees of the House and Senate and Members of Congress. Why does not the gentleman include Members of Congress in this resolution?

Mr. GOOD. Well, they never have been; and I have simply followed the custom that has obtained in the Congress for a great many years.

Mr. BRAND. I know it never has been done, and that is the reason why I ask the question. Why should the gentleman exclude Members from the terms of the resolution?

Mr. GOOD. I suppose it was the intention of Congress to take care of those employees who receive comparatively small salaries and who at this season of the year are very anxious to have their pay immediately before Christmas.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Members of Congress are presumed not to need that.

Mr. BRAND. I know; but—

Mr. GOOD. I can not give the gentleman any further reason.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

REMOVAL OF LIMITATION FOR PURCHASES OF LAND AND CONSTRUCTION IN MILITARY POSTS.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I submit a privileged report from the Committee on Rules.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report it.

The Clerk read as follows:

The Committee on Rules, to which was referred House resolution 415, submits a privileged report on said resolution, with the recommendation that the same be agreed to.

The resolution is as follows:

House resolution 415.

*Resolved.* That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of H. R. 8819, a bill to amend an act entitled "An act making appropriations for support of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes," approved July 11, 1919. After general debate, which shall continue not to exceed one hour, one-half to be controlled by those favoring the bill and one-half by those opposing, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. Thereupon the committee shall rise and report the bill to the House, with such amendments as may have been agreed to, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on all amendments and on the bill to its passage without intervening motion, except one motion to recommit.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, this resolution makes it in order for the House to consider the bill to allow the War Department to conclude contracts, finish payments made with respect to the purchase of aviation, infantry, and artillery fields made subsequent to the signing of the armistice. These contracts were suspended by a provision in the Army appropriation bill some months ago, and it is thought desirable by the Committee on Military Affairs that the matter be brought before the House and considered as provided in the resolution.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. I yield first to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. WALSH. I would like to ask the gentleman if the rule confines general debate to the bill?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Not in so many words, but it is not intended, I understand, that any other subject is to be discussed except the merits of the matter brought before the House.

Mr. WALSH. How much does this appropriation bill carry?

Mr. ANTHONY. Nine millions and some hundred thousand dollars.

Mr. WALSH. Is one hour's debate on a nine-million dollar appropriation bill rather liberal?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. It is intended, I understand, to allow liberal debate under the five-minute rule as these separate items are read. It is thought it would be more useful to the House to discuss the merits of the individual projects when they are reached than to spend time in discussion in general debate.

Mr. WALSH. The gentleman understands there will be no effort to shut off legitimate discussion under the five-minute rule?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. That is my understanding.

Mr. BLANTON. There was an application, as I understand, for a rule to the gentleman's committee some time ago on the resolution to show deserved recognition for the splendid services rendered by Gen. Crowder during the war. May I ask the gentleman what has become of that resolution before his committee?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. It is still pending.

Mr. BLANTON. May I ask the gentleman what is holding back that very deserved recognition to which Gen. Crowder is entitled?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. The matter is being held back, and it is not germane to the matter now under consideration to tell why or by whom.

Mr. BEANTON. Something is holding it back.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Yes. Something is holding it back. It is not now under consideration.

Mr. CRAMTON. The gentleman is aware that it is very helpful to the Members to have a little advance knowledge of legislation that is to come up. Lack of that information causes a great deal of inconvenience to some of us. Can the gentleman from Kansas or the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] indicate as to what legislation is to come up in the House in the near future? I assume this bill will be passed to-day, and I would be glad to have some intimation as to what is to come up to-morrow and on Saturday.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. The gentleman raises an interesting question. I have not taken that matter up with the Speaker or majority leader. I do think we should provide for a statement from the Chair or from the majority leader as to what the business of the House shall be within the next two or three days. I do not think the practice of bringing a rule in for the immediate consideration of a bill without notice to the House is desirable. This is a matter that I have thought of taking up with the Committee on Rules and probably submit it to the House, together with some other amendments.

Mr. MONDELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. I yield.

Mr. MONDELL. The gentleman knows it is not always possible to inform the House very far in advance as to what business is to be taken up. A week ago a tentative arrangement was made for a report from the committee on war expenditure investigation to-day. Owing to the illness of one of the members of that committee it was impossible to have that order of business to-day. It became necessary to present this in lieu of that order of business. That was unavoidable. To-morrow is Private Calendar day. I imagine that we will spend the day on the Private Calendar; and Saturday, if the Member who has been indisposed is better and is prepared, the matter of the report from the committee on war expenditure investigation will be brought up. Monday we will take up the Unanimous Consent Calendar.

Mr. CRAMTON. But, Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman from Kansas will yield further, in the event the gentleman referred to is still ill on Saturday, then we may expect on Saturday a rule will be brought in without notice to the House to bring up some other legislation?

Mr. MONDELL. I do not know just how it will be arranged so far in advance. I do not think the House ever has arranged to provide far in advance in regard to legislation to take the place of measures that by reason of some unexpected contingency can not be taken up. I think the House should be informed as far in advance as possible as to the business that is to come up, but it is not always possible to determine, because of many considerations. The committees do not always know just when they are going to be ready to present their matters.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker—

Mr. MONDELL. Will the gentleman yield to me just a moment further?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. I will.

Mr. MONDELL. The Committee on Military Affairs was promised long ago that when they were ready to present this bill an opportunity would be granted them as soon as possible, as it is an important piece of legislation. But it is not always possible for a committee to determine in advance when they can report, and in this particular case there was a question as to which of two matters should be considered to-day, and that question was determined on the reasons I have just stated.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, what I have said, and what I still say, is that it is desirable that the House shall be notified as far in advance as possible what subject will be considered, if some rule or practice to that effect can be agreed upon.

Mr. CRAMTON. I know that no one in the House expects anything more than that.

Mr. FESS. Will the gentleman from Kansas yield?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. I will.

Mr. FESS. I wanted to ask the chairman of the committee whether it would be feasible to print in the Calendar such matters as we know are coming up and state the time. I do not know whether it could be done, and have it placed in the Calendar from day to day, by handing it to the tally clerk, who arranges the Calendar, so that when we pick up the Calendar we will know what is to come up in accordance with the arrangement of the steering committee in their recommendations. I realize as much as anyone in the House the inconvenience that

we all suffer in not knowing what is coming up except on special days.

Mr. LITTLE. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. LITTLE] desires to ask me a question, and I will yield to him first.

Mr. LITTLE. I find in the bill \$1,100,000 to buy land at Camp Bragg, N. C.; \$811,000 to buy land at Camp Knox, Ky.; and \$515,000 to buy land at Camp Benning, Ga. That is \$3,000,000 of this money that is to go to buy real estate for more camps. Has the Committee on Rules investigated that sufficiently so that it believes it to be an urgent necessity, or does it expect to depend on the Committee on Military Affairs for that information?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. I understand the Committee on Military Affairs has stricken out some of the figures to which the gentleman has referred.

Mr. LITTLE. They are back in again as amendment.

Mr. ANTHONY. It has been materially reduced in some instances. Most of the figures the gentleman refers to are in the bill, and at the proper time we will be glad to show the reason for them.

Mr. LITTLE. But covering that point the Committee on Rules has no information?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. In a general way. The Committee on Rules has sufficient information to justify it in bringing it to the House in considering the bill.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for one minute?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Yes.

Mr. SNELL. I voted to bring this rule out on the floor of the House. While as an individual I do not believe that I am in sympathy with a single one of the items carried in the bill, yet after the statement made by the acting chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs, in which he showed what a critical condition several of these projects are in and how the Government would lose more money in some cases by not buying them than it would by purchasing them on account of the rent we were paying at the present time, I considered that it was of enough importance to warrant the bringing of this matter on the floor of the House and allowing all the Members to get full information and act upon it as they saw fit.

I am not in favor of the proposition, but it is of importance that this House should consider it at this time.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield now?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Yes.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. I wish to say to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL], speaking generally, and not with respect to the individual matter to which this resolution relates, that as a new Member of the House, not connected with any important committee, I have found a good deal of embarrassment in the fact that notice is not given in advance of the business to be considered by the House. Ordinarily that is the case. The most important business the House considers is taken up under special rules, such as that now proposed, or on the call of committees, without notice previously given—really without notice of any kind. I am very glad to hear the gentleman from Kansas express the purpose to make an attempt to devise a rule to correct that condition. My investigation leads me to think—and I have made some investigation of the subject—that this is the one great legislative body where no effective effort is made to notify the membership beforehand of the business that is to be dealt with at a particular session.

I find that in the English House of Commons an arrangement is made for some notice; that in the French Assembly notice is given at the conclusion of a day's session of the business that will be taken up at the next session, and that this is also true of the German Reichstag. It seems to me that it is exceedingly desirable, if the Members of the House are to try to take part in its business—and the duty of doing this was impressed upon us all in a very strong and interesting speech made some time ago by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN]—that some attempt ought to be made to afford them the opportunity to know at least some hours in advance what business will be considered. I congratulate my friend from Kansas on his purpose to do that. [Applause.]

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. That is very desirable. I have very little more time, Mr. Speaker, and—

Mr. WATSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Yes.

Mr. WATSON of Pennsylvania. I wanted to know whether the bill that your rule makes in order to-day covers all cases where the Government has contracted for purchase of property for war purposes and has not sufficient money to pay the balance of the purchase money?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. I am not advised as to that; but the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ANTHONY], the acting chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs, is advised.

Mr. WATSON of Pennsylvania. Does the bill include only a few cases or all? I have several instances in my district where the purchase money has not passed, although the Government has held title for a year and a half; rents not paid, though promised by the War Department, and the owners are suffering financially by reason thereof.

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Yes.

Mr. ANTHONY. I will say that the bill does not cover all cases; only those that we have been able to give some investigation to and which are most urgent.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the remainder of my time. I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT].

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, before the gentleman yields to me, he yields to me with the right to yield?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Yes; with the right to yield.

Mr. GARRETT. Before the gentleman yields the floor and before that time begins to run, I want to say it has been suggested to me that it might be desirable to get unanimous consent to amend the rule so that the time will be in the control of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL] and the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. DENT]. As the rule reads, it says the time shall be "in control of those in favor of and those against." If that meets the approval of the gentleman, I shall be satisfied.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. I shall make that request before moving the previous question on the resolution.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. That will be the case, anyhow.

Mr. GARRETT. The rule says, "those in favor and those against."

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Whoever is recognized will get a half hour.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. I shall make that request before moving the previous question.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, this resolution is to make in order a bill which will give the House an opportunity to correct a mistake that was made some months ago, when the majority, without proper investigation, forced legislation through here which has tied up the execution of contracts that had been entered into in good faith and which has put a very large number of property owners to very great inconvenience. I think it is very desirable that the House should have that opportunity of correcting that mistake and of perfecting the legislation that is essential along the lines involved in the bill.

Now, I reserve the remainder of my time. I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. FISHER].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, this is very much like a motion for a new trial where the parties come into court and ask that the relief asked for should now be granted. The items that are given in the bill are items for the purchase of land which in almost every case the Government has contracted to buy.

Now, the question involved here is a very much broader one than simply the fact that the Government could save money by passing this measure to-day, and I am in favor of considering it now, because I am in favor of the Government carrying out its contracts which have been entered into with its citizens in all good faith.

We were under specific obligations in these cases to buy land—under obligations both moral and legal. The Government took over the property. Farmers in many cases—I may say in most cases—were the owners of the property, and it caused them to leave their farms, crops, and everything, and they are left now, right to-day, after a long lapse of time, without relief, and no means of taking a step forward as to what they will do in the acquisition of further property, because they do not know what the Government is going to do. We have found cases where the Government has actually received the deed to the property. I know a case, an item in this bill with which I am familiar, where the Government now holds the deed and has served all the proper legal notices of the exercise of its option and having accepted the deed and with no money to pay for the property is not even paying rent for the land. There is not just one case, but there are a number of cases just like it.

Mr. LAYTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISHER. I will.

Mr. LAYTON. Do I understand that the act of July 11, 1919, prevented the Government from purchasing land where they had made contracts, where they had entered upon it and used it?

Mr. FISHER. It did. It actually prohibited them where they had exercised the right of option to purchase from even paying rent any longer. Thousands of dollars to-day are due property owners for rent, and there is no way to bring about a settlement. The land is held and is being used by the Government, and the property owners have no hope unless this bill is passed or something done to make the Government carry out its obligations.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISHER. Yes.

Mr. LINTHICUM. That is the case at Camp Holabird, Md., where the Government agreed to accept the property, occupied it for a long time, and refuses to carry out the contract.

Mr. LAYTON. What I can not understand is this, can Congress, by virtue of its authority, break a contract which Congress has authorized the Government to make?

Mr. LINTHICUM. Congress can do it by not appropriating the money to carry out the contract.

Mr. FISHER. There are cases to-day where the Government is in court, having filed petitions for condemnation. To-day if the parties go into court and ask that the case be dismissed it would be dismissed because the Government has no money with which to pay an award. The Government would lose its rights, and if it files other condemnation suits the value would be fixed on the property as of the day it filed the new suit.

Throughout the country hundreds of millions of dollars have been spent upon this property. The Government could take the improvements off, such as buildings, but they have spent millions of dollars improving the property in many ways, and this increased value would be absolutely lost to the Government unless this bill is passed enabling the Government to profit by the increased value by simply carrying out its obligations. In some cases the Government now may have lost its rights. The quicker this measure becomes a law the quicker the relief will be given to property owners, and the Government will be saved millions of dollars in damages.

I want to show you the way the Government has treated the farmer, and it is always said that in legislative bodies farmers have a preferential right. Under a mineral claims law we have provided for an adjustment board, and millions of dollars are being paid those who started operations on mines to produce minerals for the prosecution of the war. We have paid large sums to the shipbuilders for wooden ships that we have now no use on earth for, and also for houses that were used to house the employees. Large sums are given them for damages. We are paying out hundreds of millions on informal contracts, contracts that were not even signed. The Congress passed a bill which gave the War Department that right. We are even preparing to pay out many millions of dollars—I do not know exactly how much—to people who have planted castor beans.

I say that when we go that far and when farmers and property owners have been driven from their homes and farms and no assurance given as to when they would be paid for their property, it looks to me like it is a very much more serious proposition and a broader issue than the mere question of whether or not we save money now by passing this measure—it is a question whether or not we make good our obligations.

Mr. ROSE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISHER. Yes.

Mr. ROSE. In these cases, were they started by contract or condemnation proceedings?

Mr. FISHER. In practically every instance there is either a contract or a petition for condemnation.

It is also a question of business judgment, and every member of the committee, after a very careful study, states that it will save money, millions of dollars, if the Government is given authority to complete these transactions.

Mr. ROSE. As a legal proposition, is not a party filing condemnation proceedings forced under the law to make the purchase of the property?

Mr. FISHER. You can not force the United States Government. The property owners can force the Government only by going to the Court of Claims, and every Member of Congress knows what it means to go to the Court of Claims. I say that it is not the proper treatment to accord the people to whom we promised to pay money.

We took away the land for aviation fields and camp sites and built buildings on them, and that land has been destroyed for the purpose that the farmers used it, and when the question of

damages comes up, then in many cases nearly the total value of the land will be eaten up by damages which will have to be paid the property owners. Land that was used for rice fields, the levees have been torn down and the pumping stations taken away, and it is entirely unfitted for its former use.

There are many cases where the damages are the total value of the land.

I have told all those who made inquiries of me as to the probable outcome that the majority leader in this House had assured us when the item was put in the Army appropriation bill last June that this matter would be righted. The leader of the majority, speaking on June 13, specifically stated:

In my opinion, we will be in session some months, and after this provision becomes a law the War Department will let us know speedily and promptly what the different obligations are, and we will meet them.

So it seems to me this measure should meet with no opposition whatsoever, if we believe in contracts, if we believe in economy, if we believe in carrying on the War Department for any purpose whatsoever; because these items here provide for flying fields; and every single officer who has been before our committee has said these flying fields are absolutely essential to the success of our service. The same applies to the development of the Infantry and to the development of the Artillery.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. KNUTSON. May the gentleman have an additional minute? I should like to ask him a question.

The SPEAKER. The time is controlled by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT].

Mr. GARRETT. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. KNUTSON. I would like to ask the gentleman if the officials who entered into these contracts had authority to do so?

Mr. FISHER. They had full authority.

Mr. KNUTSON. There is no question about that?

Mr. FISHER. None on earth.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Tennessee has just stated that there was no question about the legal authority of those who made these contracts to make them. I understand the Committee on Military Affairs find that many of these contracts were made without proper authority, for the reason that they were made after the armistice was signed.

Mr. CALDWELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. No.

Contracts were made for large areas of land that were of questionable necessity after the armistice was signed, and it is for the consummation of these contracts, upon which millions of money were expended both for purchase price and for improvements, that it is necessary that Congress now, in order to protect itself and the Government, conclude the contracts by paying the balance of the purchase price. Miles of areas were purchased in one section, farms here and there over large areas, leaving farms scattered through these areas which were not purchased, and it is for the purpose of paying the purchase price of these scattered portions of land in these large areas in order to complete the Government holdings and enable the Government to use the land at all that it is necessary to spend some of this money.

Mr. CALDWELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. I do not yield.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. The contracts were made with questionable authority, and the Congress acted wisely upon the information it had at the time when it refused to make the money further available for the payment for lands that were contracted for under the questionable authority of the War Department, because the War Department entered into these contracts after the armistice was signed.

Mr. KREIDER. Hundreds of millions of dollars worth.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. It is for the purpose of saving millions of dollars that have already been spent that it is necessary now to spend hundreds of thousands of dollars, and, in some instances, millions of dollars. It is like buying furniture on the installment plan and paying all but \$7. By the failure to pay the \$7 you lose the furniture. On failure to finish the payment for these lands the Government will lose all the money that it has expended already, and unwisely expended in many instances.

Mr. LITTLE. The report of the Committee on Military Affairs says:

There is no doubt whatever that millions of dollars of the money which Congress voted for the conduct of the war and placed no restrictions thereon have been expended illegally and without warrant of law by the War Department in the purchases of land and the construction of new military posts since the armistice and without the express authority of Congress, as should have been the case.

Just exactly what the gentleman from Kansas says, and it is a unanimous report.

Mr. CALDWELL. It is not.

Mr. FIELDS. It is not a unanimous report. I am a member of the committee and it is not unanimous.

Mr. LITTLE. I am sorry it is not, because from all I can learn it should be. The gentleman from Nebraska says it is unanimous.

Mr. FIELDS. And there is matter in the report that the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ANTHONY] agreed not to put in the report.

The SPEAKER. Gentlemen must observe the rules of the House, and not address the House until they receive permission.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I think I have the floor.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kansas has the floor.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. I yield to the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. LAYTON] for a question.

Mr. LAYTON. Do I understand that the act of July 11, 1919, was designed by this Congress to affect contracts made by the Federal Government for a right of way for a railroad, for instance, that they graded, that they put the tracks upon, and that they used before the armistice was declared?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. I have no information as to the specific question to which the gentleman from Delaware refers. If contracts of that kind were made, of course they were with authority, but other contracts that were made subsequent to the signing of the armistice are of questionable legality.

Mr. HARRISON. Will the gentleman yield to me to allow me to make a request for unanimous consent?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. How much time have I remaining, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has 20 minutes.

Mr. HARRISON. I desire to make a request for unanimous consent that the minority have leave to file a minority report.

Mr. LITTLE. Is there any minority report in here?

Mr. HARRISON. Let me explain. This report was printed only yesterday, and the minority members of the committee had no notice whatever of the character of this report. In justice to the minority members of that committee I ask leave to file a minority report.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. I can not yield at this time for that purpose.

Mr. LITTLE. Is there any minority report here?

Mr. HARRISON. We have had no opportunity to file it.

Mr. LITTLE. I am sorry for you.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT] has some time remaining, and as I desire to close I will ask him if he desires to use his time.

Mr. GARRETT. How much time have I remaining?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has two minutes remaining.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. I yield to the gentleman 10 minutes more.

Mr. GARRETT. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. FIELDS].

Mr. FIELDS. Mr. Speaker, I had not intended to speak on the rule, but I desire to correct a statement that has just been made by gentlemen on the majority side, by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. LITTLE], I think, and by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL], that this is a unanimous report. This is not a unanimous report. It was not printed until yesterday. I happened not to notice it in the Record, and I did not know that it had been printed until a few minutes before the House convened, nor did I know that the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ANTHONY] was going before the Committee on Rules this morning to ask for a rule. I did not know, either, that the report contained certain language that is in it. I see on page 4, in the second paragraph, the following language:

There is no doubt whatever that millions of dollars of the money which Congress voted for the conduct of the war and placed no restrictions thereon have been expended illegally and without warrant of law by the War Department in the purchases of land and the construction of new military posts since the armistice and without the express authority of Congress, as should have been the case.

The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ANTHONY] included that language in his report which he submitted to the subcommittee. The gentleman from New York [Mr. CALDWELL] and I took issue with him upon that, and it was my definite understanding that that language should be omitted from his report.

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FIELDS. Yes.

Mr. CALDWELL. I will state that not only was the matter agreed to, but the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CRAIG], as I remember it, voted with the Democrats on the committee, that those provisions be stricken out of the report.

Mr. LITTLE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FIELDS. Not now. I want to finish my statement.

Mr. LITTLE. But the gentleman has quoted me.

Mr. FIELDS. That was before we had made the trip to the Southwest and the West. This meeting of the subcommittee

was after we had completed the trip to the Southwest. After the completion of the trip to the West I returned to Washington and remained here for a few days. The subcommittee was not ready to make its report. The chairman [Mr. ANTHONY] was not here. I had no notice of any further action on the proposition. I knew nothing more of it until I learned this morning that the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ANTHONY] had asked for this special rule, but I did know, and I do know now, that my colleague from Kansas [Mr. ANTHONY] agreed not to include in the report the language that I have just read.

I have always regarded him as one of the fairest men in the House. I would not say anything disparaging of him personally, but I am surprised, Mr. Speaker, in view of the facts that I have stated that he has included in his report the language that I have just read.

Mr. LITTLE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FIELDS. I yield.

Mr. LITTLE. Of course, anyone examining the report would see no indications of a minority report, and that is, of course, what the House had to go by; but there are three specific items in this bill to which I direct attention, Camp Bragg, Camp Knox, Camp Benning. Does the gentleman not think that instead of generalizing about the proposition it would better help the House if he would just tell, not in any generalization but by specific direction, to the specific statutes, what authority somebody down in the department had to buy these three places—

Mr. FIELDS. I can not yield further to the gentleman at this time, but will do so in the consideration of the bill.

Mr. LITTLE. And if there has been violation of law, see that they are punished for violating the law?

Mr. FIELDS. Inasmuch as the subcommittee has not been called together and that I have had no notice of it, I desire to renew the request of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HAN-  
NISON] that the minority have permission to file a minority report.

Mr. LITTLE. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the gentleman whether that report will contain a specific direction of the attention of the House to the specific law under which anybody had authority to make these expenditures.

Mr. FIELDS. We will attempt in that report to be absolutely fair.

Mr. LITTLE. Is it the gentleman's idea of fairness that it shall tell us by what specific authority of law these men bought these lands.

Mr. FIELDS. Why, certainly.

Mr. REAVIS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, inasmuch as the gentleman says that the minority members of the Military Committee did not know what was to be in the report, because it has just been filed, and inasmuch as the Members of the House did not know anything about this bill, because we have had no opportunity to look at the hearings, would it not be a pretty good idea to defeat this rule so as to give an opportunity to file a minority report and give the Members of the House opportunity to find out something about the legislation.

Mr. FIELDS. I think if we can not get this consent that the rule should be defeated. I realize the necessity for this legislation. Men have been moved off their lands and are entitled to compensation for them. The legislation should be enacted, but if unanimous consent is not granted for the filing of a minority report I shall vote against the rule, and I hope that the House will defeat it.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ANTHONY].

Mr. FIELDS. Mr. Speaker, what has become of my request?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kentucky asks unanimous consent that the minority may file their views. Is there objection?

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object—

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Within what time?

Mr. ANTHONY. I will state for the information of the House that the report upon this bill was ordered by the Committee on Military Affairs over one month ago. The minority has had a month in which to prepare a minority report and file it, and the House ought not now to permit them to make amends for delinquency in that respect.

Mr. REAVIS. Mr. Speaker, is a request for unanimous consent pending?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ANTHONY] reserves the right to object.

Mr. ANTHONY. And I do object, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kansas objects.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANTHONY. Yes.

Mr. KITCHIN. Did the gentleman from Kansas read this report to the committee?

Mr. ANTHONY. "The gentleman from Kansas" did not read this report to the committee.

Mr. KITCHIN. Sometimes gentlemen do that and sometimes they do not.

Mr. ANTHONY. I would say to the gentleman that the question of the subcommittee which investigated these camps and cantonments making a formal report had been taken up at several meetings of the subcommittee and had been considered. I had prepared some material for such a report. Some of the language in that report was taken exception to by some of the members of the committee, by the gentleman from New York [Mr. CALDWELL], and perhaps by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. FIELDS], as they state, and we dropped any idea of the subcommittee making a formal report.

And in this regular report which I made to the House in compliance with the orders of the Committee on Military Affairs I expressly stated:

The following extracts from notes made by the chairman of the subcommittee of the House Committee on Military Affairs are printed for information.

I think that clears the situation.

Mr. FISHER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANTHONY. I will.

Mr. FISHER. I would like to ask whether or not the gentleman has legal advice from any department of the Government or from any lawyer that the contracts which the Government entered into in the cases which we have under discussion were illegal?

Mr. ANTHONY. Oh, I guess in so far as the contracts go they were perhaps legal, those made before the armistice; but I will also say to the gentleman the bulk of the money expended at the three large Army camps and the cantonments covered by this bill was made after the armistice out of money which Congress appropriated for the conduct of the war and which I believe a majority of our committee think was illegally expended.

Mr. FISHER. I will ask the gentleman whether or not the money expended as suggested by him was not in improvements and not so much in the purchase of land?

Mr. ANTHONY. It is for both.

Mr. REAVIS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANTHONY. I will.

Mr. REAVIS. Is it not a fact that the Secretary of War came before your committee and asked the justification of Congress for his illegal expenditures?

Mr. ANTHONY. I had not intended to go into that at this time, when we are considering the rule, but in response to the gentleman from Nebraska I will state right here that way back in January the Secretary of War and the Assistant Secretary of War did come before the Committee on Military Affairs. He had evidently heard the criticism which had been made on the floor of the House about these expenditures, and he informed our committee that he believed, if I remember correctly, that he had the legal right to expend this money, but not the moral right, and he asked our committee—

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. I will yield the gentleman one minute more.

Mr. ANTHONY. And he asked our committee if it would give him informal authority to go ahead and complete the expenditures at these camps and posts. Instead of giving him that informal authority our committee informally approved the resolution which I had introduced into the House explicitly directing the War Department to cease such expenditures. Thereupon the Secretary of War and the department officials went to the Senate Committee on Military Affairs and asked for the same permission to go ahead with these expenditures.

The Senate committee by a tie vote, if I remember correctly, refused to give this authority, and the story goes that subsequently a Senator from one of these States where these immense expenditures were being made went to the War Department and carried the assurance there that the Senate committee, if all the members had been present, would have approved such expenditures, and on that flimsy authority the War Department went ahead and further expended millions of dollars.

Mr. DENT. Will my colleague yield?

Mr. ANTHONY. I will yield.

Mr. DENT. Is not my colleague mistaken in this respect, that the Secretary of War and the Assistant Secretary of War came before the Committee on Military Affairs of the House last January and asked our advice, stating that they considered

that they had the legal authority, but they wanted our advice, and we thought that was not a part of the duties of the Committee on Military Affairs?

Mr. ANTHONY. What the gentleman states is substantially correct.

Mr. SNELL. Will the gentleman yield? I understand the subcommittee—

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. I yield the gentleman one more minute.

Mr. SNELL. I understand the subcommittee of the Military Affairs Committee has made a personal investigation of each one of these items.

Mr. ANTHONY. They devoted a great deal of time, not to every item but to most of them. It traveled over 8,000 miles of this country and personally inspected most of the propositions involved in this bill.

Mr. SNELL. Is there any possible way of getting that information before the House any better than to bring it up for discussion and let those Members give their information to the House at this time?

Mr. ANTHONY. I do not know of any better way.

Mr. SNELL. That is the reason I was in favor of bringing it on the floor of the House and getting the information before the House and let the House decide as it saw fit.

Mr. BUTLER. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield me a minute or two more?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. I yield one minute.

Mr. GARRETT. I would like to ask the gentleman if he is not willing to waive the objection he made, or withdraw the objection he made, to the filing of minority views? Now, it seems to me, if the gentleman will permit, that he is doing the minority an injustice in not permitting them to do that. They do not ask for delay in the consideration of the bill, and, as I understand, all they are asking is permission to put in as part of this official report their contention as to the legality of certain matters.

Mr. ANTHONY. I have no objection to the filing of minority views, but I do object to criticism of gentlemen which were made on the floor here directed to myself when the gentlemen making the criticism have had over a month in which to file that report, and if anyone is responsible it is their neglect.

Mr. GARRETT. Of course, this report was not printed until yesterday. Now, the attention of the Committee on Rules was not brought to the report, and there was no necessity for bringing it to the attention of the Committee on Rules, but I think there would have been a different feeling about this matter to some extent if it were known the minority had been denied the right to file their views.

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Speaker, at the request of the gentleman, I withdraw my objection to the filing of the minority views.

Mr. REAVIS. Mr. Speaker, I believe there is pending the request for unanimous consent, and, reserving the right to object, there is no time set in which this minority report shall be filed. In all probability it will be filed after the House has acted upon this bill. There is nobody, as far as the House is concerned, who knows anything about the bill. We have not had any opportunity to learn about it, and now comes the request that the report shall be filed after the House is through with the measure. I object.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will not the gentleman reserve his right to object?

Mr. REAVIS. I reserve the right to object.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, after all, the majority ought always to give the minority some rights. Here is a report which I think is an admirable report, but it in effect criticizes quite severely a Cabinet officer of the administration, and on the face of it it would appear that the minority Members of the House had joined in that report. Now, as a matter of fact, we know that the report of a committee is usually written by a member of the committee, and is ordinarily not submitted to the committee itself for revision. It seems to me that in all justice we ought to give the minority members of the Committee on Military Affairs a chance to place themselves on record in reference to a criticism of a Cabinet officer belonging to their administration. I think the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. REAVIS] ought not to object. I think this report ought to be filed within a reasonable time.

Mr. FIELD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Speaker, we ask five days.

Mr. REAVIS. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, there is no position that a minority member of this committee may want to make known that he can not make known during the discussion of this bill if the rule is adopted. I am not objecting for the purpose of depriving the minority of the right to make any expression of their views.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the regular order.

Mr. REAVIS. I am objecting, Mr. Speaker, with the idea that it will contribute something toward the defeat of this rule. I object.

Mr. BLANTON. If the gentleman is going to object in the end, why—

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the time allotted under the rule for general debate be divided, one-half to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ANTHONY] and one-half to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. DENT].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman asks unanimous consent that the rule be amended by giving control of half of the time for general debate to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ANTHONY] and half to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. DENT]. Is there objection?

Mr. WALSH. It seems as though that request ought to come after acting on the rule.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman asks to amend that rule.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, the rule provides one hour of general debate, one-half to be controlled by those in favor of the bill and one-half to be controlled by those opposed to it. I did not suppose the Committee on Rules would be autocratic enough to bring in a rule that all the time should be controlled by those in favor of the bill and give no time to those opposed to the bill, but the gentleman seems to want to do that indirectly which he would not have attempted to do directly. Suppose some one wants to oppose the bill, what chance will they get? I do not hear any response.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. I did not know anybody was opposed to it.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. There are lots who are opposed to the bill. It is one of the worst things that ever came into the House and ought to be beaten by a two-thirds vote. But I shall not object.

Mr. WALSH. I will.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. If objection is made—

Mr. WALSH. I object.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. I move the previous question on the adoption of the rule.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the rule.

Mr. REAVIS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Nebraska raises the point of no quorum. The Chair will count. [After counting.] The Chair thinks there is no quorum present. The Doorkeeper will close the doors and the Sergeant at Arms will notify the absentees. Those who are in favor of adopting the rule will, as their names are called, answer "yea" and those opposed will answer "nay," and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 259, nays 70, answered "present" 1, not voting 102, as follows:

YEAS—259.

Ackerman	Campbell, Kans.	Dieklison, Mo.	Greene, Vt.
Alexander	Campbell, Pa.	Drane	Griest
Almon	Candler	Dunbar	Hadley
Andrews, Md.	Cantrill	Dupré	Hardy, Colo.
Anthony	Caraway	Dyer	Hardy, Tex.
Ashbrook	Cars	Egan	Harrison
Aswell	Casey	Edmonds	Hayden
Ayres	Chindblom	Elliott	Hays
Bakka	Christopherson	Elston	Hellin
Bankhead	Cleary	Esch	Hernandez
Barkley	Cole	Fess	Hersman
Bee	Collier	Fisher	Hickey
Bell	Connally	Focht	Hicks
Benham	Cooper	Fordney	Hill
Benson	Copley	Foster	Hoch
Black	Costello	French	Holland
Boles	Crago	Fuller, Ill.	Hull, Iowa
Bowers	Crisp	Fuller, Mass.	Hull, Tenn.
Box	Crowther	Gallagher	Hutchinson
Brand	Cullen	Gallivan	Ireland
Briggs	Currie, Mich.	Gandy	Jacaway
Brinton	Curry, Calif.	Gandy	Johnson, Miss.
Brooks, Ill.	Dale	Gard	Johnson, S. Dak.
Browning	Dallinger	Garner	Johnson, Wash.
Brumbaugh	Darrow	Garrett	Jones, Pa.
Buchanan	Davey	Glynn	Joni
Burdick	Davis, Minn.	Godwin, N. C.	Kelly, Pa.
Butler	Davis, Tenn.	Gould	Kennedy, Iowa
Byrns, Tenn.	Dempsey	Green, Iowa	Kennedy, R. I.
Caldwell	Dent	Greene, Mass.	Kettner

Kieess	Major	Parrish	Stephens, Miss.
Kincheloe	Mann, S. C.	Pell	Stiness
Kitchin	Mansfield	Platt	Stoll
Knutson	Mapes	Pou	Strong, Kans.
Kreider	Martin	Purnell	Strong, Pa.
LaGuardia	Mason	Radcliffe	Summers, Wash.
Lampert	Mays	Rainey, Ala.	Tague
Lanham	Mead	Rainey, H. T.	Taylor, Colo.
Lankford	Merritt	Rainey, J. W.	Temple
Larsen	Minahan, N. J.	Raker	Tilman
Lezano	Minahan, Wis.	Randall, Calif.	Tison
Lee, Calif.	Mondell	Rayburn	Timberlake
Lee, Ga.	Montague	Reber	Tincher
Lehbach	Moon	Rhodes	Valle
Leshner	Mooney	RJordan	Vare
Linthicum	Moore, Ohio	Robinson, N. C.	Vestal
Little	Moore, Va.	Robison, Ky.	Vinson
Loneragan	Moore, Ind.	Rodenberg	Volstead
Longworth	Morgan	Romjue	Walters
Luce	Mudd	Rose	Watson, Pa.
Lufkin	Neely	Rubey	Weaver
Lubring	Nelson, Mo.	Sanford	Welling
McAndrews	Nelson, Wis.	Sherwood	Welty
McCulloch	Newton, Minn.	Shreve	Whaley
McDuffie	O'Connell	Sinnott	White, Kans.
McGlennon	O'Connor	Slemp	Wilson, La.
McKenzie	Ogden	Small	Wingo
McKiniry	Oldfield	Smith, Idaho	Winslow
McKinley	Oliver	Smith, Mich.	Woods, Ind.
McLaughlin, Mich.	Olney	Smithwick	Woods, Va.
McLaughlin, Nebr.	Overstreet	Snell	Woodward
McPherson	Padgett	Snyder	Wright
Madden	Paige	Stegall	Yates
Magee	Park	Stedman	Zibelman
Maher	Parker	Steenerson	

NAYS—70.

Andrews, Nebr.	Evans, Mont.	Kinkaid	Sells
Bacharach	Evans, Nebr.	Kieccka	Siegel
Begg	Evans, Nev.	Kraus	Sims
Bland, Ind.	Fields	Layton	Stevenson
Bland, Va.	Freeman	McArthur	Sweet
Blanton	Good	McClintic	Thomas
Byraes, S. C.	Goodykoentz	McFadden	Tinkham
Cannon	Graham, Pa.	Mann, Ill.	Towner
Carter	Graham, Ill.	Michener	Treadway
Clark, Mo.	Harrell	Quin	Voigt
Classon	Haskell	Ramseyer	Walsh
Cramton	Hastings	Reavis	Watkins
Dickinson, Iowa	Hawley	Ricketts	Williams
Dominick	Howard	Rogers	Wilson, Ill.
Dowell	Huddleston	Rouse	Wilson, Pa.
Dunn	Hulings	Rowe	Young, N. Dak.
Echols	Jones, Tex.	Sanders, N. Y.	
Emerson	Keller	Scott	

ANSWERED "PRESENT" 1.

Haugen

NOT VOTING—102.

Anderson	Garland	MacGregor	Scully
Baer	Goldfogle	Miller	Sears
Barbour	Goodall	Moore, Pa.	Sinclair
Blackmon	Goodwin, Ark.	Morin	Sisson
Bland, Mo.	Griffin	Mott	Smith, Ill.
Booher	Hamil	Murphy	Smith, N. Y.
Britten	Hamilton	Newton, Mo.	Steele
Brooks, Pa.	Hersey	Nicholls, S. C.	Stephens, Ohio
Browne	Houghton	Nichols, Mich.	Sullivan
Burke	Hudspeth	Nolan	Summers, Tex.
Burroughs	Humphreys	Osborne	Swope
Carew	Husted	Peters	Taylor, Ark.
Clark, Fla.	Igoe	Phelan	Taylor, Tenn.
Coady	James	Porter	Thompson
Denison	Jeffers	Ramsey	Upshaw
Dewalt	Johnson, Ky.	Randall, Wis.	Venable
Denovan	Johnston, N. Y.	Reed, N. Y.	Ward
Doolling	Kahn	Reed, W. Va.	Wason
Doremus	Kearns	Riddick	Watson, Va.
Doughton	Kelley, Mich.	Rowan	Wetster
Eagle	Kendall	Rucker	Wheeler
Edsworth	King	Sabath	White, Me.
Fairfield	Langley	Sanders, Ind.	Wise
Ferris	McKeown	Sanders, La.	Young, Tex.
Flood	McLane	Saunders, Va.	
Frear	MacCrate	Schall	

So the resolution was agreed to.  
The Clerk announced the following pairs:  
Until further notice:

- Mr. HAUGEN with Mr. SULLIVAN.
- Mr. SINCLAIR with Mr. DOOLING.
- Mr. BURROUGHS with Mr. FERRIS.
- Mr. NOLAN with Mr. McKEOWN.
- Mr. SANDERS of Indiana with Mr. IGOE.
- Mr. MILLER with Mr. DOUGHTON.
- Mr. DENISON with Mr. FLOOD.
- Mr. FAIRFIELD with Mr. WATSON of Virginia.
- Mr. BARBOUR with Mr. YOUNG of Texas.
- Mr. NEWTON of Missouri with Mr. DOREMUS.
- Mr. NICHOLS of Michigan with Mr. DONOVAN.
- Mr. OSBORNE with Mr. DEWALT.
- Mr. PETERS with Mr. CAREW.
- Mr. PORTER with Mr. BLAND of Missouri.
- Mr. BRITTEN with Mr. WISE.
- Mr. BROOKS of Pennsylvania with Mr. VENABLE.
- Mr. BROWNE with Mr. UPSHAW.
- Mr. BURKE with Mr. TAYLOR of Arkansas.

Mr. ELLSWORTH with Mr. SUMNERS of Texas.  
Mr. FREAR with Mr. STEELE.  
Mr. GARLAND with Mr. SMITH of New York.  
Mr. GOODALL with Mr. SISSON.  
Mr. HAMILTON with Mr. SEARS.  
Mr. HOUGHTON with Mr. SCULLY.  
Mr. RAMSEY with Mr. BLACKMON.  
Mr. RANDALL of Wisconsin with Mr. NICHOLS of South Carolina.

Mr. REED of West Virginia with Mr. McLANE.  
Mr. RIDDICK with Mr. JOHNSTON of New York.  
Mr. SMITH of Illinois with Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky.  
Mr. STEPHENS of Ohio with Mr. HUMPHREYS.  
Mr. THOMPSON with Mr. HUDSPETH.  
Mr. WARD with Mr. HAMILL.  
Mr. HUSTED with Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia.  
Mr. KAHN with Mr. SANDERS of Louisiana.  
Mr. KENDALL with Mr. SABATH.  
Mr. KING with Mr. RUCKER.  
Mr. LANGLEY with Mr. ROWAN.  
Mr. MORIN with Mr. PHELAN.  
Mr. MURPHY with Mr. EAGLE.  
Mr. WASON with Mr. GRIFFIN.  
Mr. WHEELER with Mr. GOODWIN of Arkansas.  
Mr. WHITE of Maine with Mr. GOLDFOGLE.

The result of the vote was announced, as above recorded.  
The SPEAKER. A quorum is present. The Doorkeeper will unlock the doors.

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 8819.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kansas moves that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 8819. The question is on agreeing to that motion.

The motion was agreed to.  
The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] will please take the chair.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 8819, with Mr. MADDEN in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 8819, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:  
A bill (H. R. 8819) to amend an act entitled "An act making appropriations for the support of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes," approved July 11, 1919.

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kansas asks unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with. Is there objection?

There was no objection.  
The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kansas is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, in July last, when the Army appropriation bill was passed by this body, we placed on it an amendment which in substance limited the further acquisition of real estate at any of the Army camps or cantonments, and prohibited new construction at such places.

The reason for the placing of that limitation on the bill was that the Committee on Military Affairs and the Members of the House, generally, had become alarmed at reports to the effect that large sums of money which we had voted for the conduct of the war were being expended as late as eight months after the conclusion of the armistice for purposes connected with the training of the Army in time of peace, and for which clearly the War Department should have come to Congress for authority to expend before proceeding to do so.

In my opinion the placing of the limitation has resulted in the saving of millions of dollars to the Treasury of the United States, but in effect the limitation held up the activities of the War Department at every one of these places. Some of them were meritorious; some of them were not. In order to arrive at some conclusion in regard to the propositions which were meritorious and upon which the War Department should be authorized to go ahead, the Committee on Military Affairs appointed a subcommittee, which has devoted a great deal of time and attention to these matters, and which, as the result of its work, has brought before the House this bill, making specific appropriations out of moneys heretofore voted for that purpose, so as to enable the War Department to continue what we believe are necessary activities at the posts and points involved.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. ANTHONY. I yield to the gentleman for a question.

Mr. LONGWORTH. May I ask why this bill is brought in in such a peculiar form? Apparently very little of the original bill is left. It comes in practically as a committee amendment.

Mr. ANTHONY. It is due to the fact that the committee was compelled to recast most of the items and change the sums involved in many of them, so that in order to simplify our work we put our own items in.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Well, I gather that the original bill was submitted by the War Department?

Mr. ANTHONY. Yes; and it was materially added to.

Mr. LONGWORTH. And the committee changed it largely because there was hardly anything left of the original bill. It is new, almost entirely.

Mr. ANTHONY. We did make radical changes in the bill.

Mr. OGDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANTHONY. Yes.

Mr. OGDEN. Was it not subsequent to the introduction of this bill that your committee investigated the camps?

Mr. ANTHONY. It was. We visited the camps for the purpose of securing information.

The situation at three of the largest propositions that are covered in this bill—points where there are from 50,000 to 100,000 acres of land involved—is that the War Department had already gone ahead and purchased from one-half to two-thirds of the land involved at each of these immense training fields, and when our amendment to the Army appropriation bill went into effect and suspended further purchases it left these propositions incomplete. The proposition presented to the committee and to the House was whether we should discontinue any further land purchases at those points, which meant the elimination of the training projects from the Army program, or whether we should permit them to go ahead and complete them. The committee is convinced, after careful investigation, of the real military value of some of them.

We feel that under the present conditions it will be cheaper and more economical to permit the Government to go ahead and complete the purchases which have been started, because if we abandon them the loss of the improvements and the bill of damages where we have contracted for land and compelled the farmers to move off their improvements and vacate their lands nearly a year ago will be nearly as great as the amounts involved in the purchases.

I want to show the House the situation at Camp Benning, Ga., as a typical illustration of the proposition that we are facing to-day in reference to Camp Benning, Ga., Camp Knox, Ky., and Camp Bragg, N. C.

At Camp Benning there are about 97,000 acres involved for a basic Infantry training school.

Previous to the armistice condemnation proceedings were started for the acquisition of the land, but after the armistice most of the money was expended for the purchase of over 60,000 acres, which has been completed. Our amendment adopted in the last appropriation bill held up the purchase of the balance of the tract, so that to-day the situation at Camp Benning is as is shown on the map, which I think the House will be able to see.

The black portion of the map represents the land which the Government has already purchased, 76,417 acres. The blue patches interspersed all through that black area are tracts of land which are under condemnation in the courts. The green patches are farms scattered all through that tract which the Government has contracted to purchase at a fixed price and which our amendment held up.

Most of the farmers on these scattered tracts have been compelled to move off their farms. The Government is in possession. On many of them the buildings have been removed or demolished. The committee came to the conclusion that if we do not go ahead and complete these land purchases the bills for damages to the evicted owners will be as great as the amount the land will cost us, regardless of the military value of the proposition, which we believe has merit.

Mr. REAVIS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANTHONY. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. REAVIS. The gentleman says most of the farmers have moved off from the tracts for which contracts of purchase have been executed.

Mr. ANTHONY. Yes; the blue spaces on the map indicate land which is under condemnation proceedings and the green spaces indicate land for which the Government has made purchase contracts.

Mr. REAVIS. What character of purchase contracts have been entered into?

Mr. ANTHONY. A contract between the Government and the owner for the purchase of the land at so much per acre.

Mr. REAVIS. Written contracts?

Mr. ANTHONY. I understand written contracts.

Mr. REAVIS. Has the gentleman ever seen any of the written contracts?

Mr. ANTHONY. Yes; I have seen copies of the contracts.

Mr. REAVIS. Do they call for payment within a specified time?

Mr. ANTHONY. I do not remember as to that, but they are legal contracts—as nearly legal as the department could draw them—on printed forms.

Mr. JUUL. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. ANTHONY. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. JUUL. What is the average cost of the land, and how much land is involved which has not yet been acquired?

Mr. ANTHONY. There are about 97,000 acres in the Benning proposition. The average cost of the land was about \$33 an acre. Some of the land cost about \$300 and some \$15 or \$20. The average cost is \$33 an acre. In my opinion the value of that land to-day, in view of the rise in the price of farm lands, is \$50 or \$60 an acre, so that the Government has a clear profit in its land purchase if it goes through with it.

Mr. JUUL. How many acres must we still purchase in order to complete the enterprise?

Mr. ANTHONY. Without the purchase of these scattered tracts the Government can not avail itself of the entire area. About 75,000 acres have been purchased.

Now, I want to state to the House the purpose underlying the purchase of this big tract.

As one of the developments of the war it was found that Infantry can only be operated in battle under the protection of Field Artillery. Our General Staff believed it necessary that we should have a training ground large enough so that in the future our Infantry officers and the noncommissioned officers and as many of the men as possible could be trained under actual battle conditions, where the Infantry could be advanced over a large area of ground protected by actual barrages of artillery with the accompaniment of tanks which we propose to make an arm of the Infantry from now on, and all of the equipment which would go with Infantry in battle.

Mr. CALDWELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANTHONY. Yes.

Mr. CALDWELL. Did the gentleman call attention to the small piece which it was decided not to buy?

Mr. ANTHONY. There is a small tract of about 800 acres, marked in red on the map, situated on the Chattahoochee River, for which the department made a contract which it is believed can be canceled, that the committee thought the Government could dispense with, and we have agreed to eliminate the amount required for the acquisition of that one tract.

Mr. HICKS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANTHONY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. HICKS. I was not here when the gentleman began his remarks. Perhaps he has covered the point. In case we should decide not to provide for the purchase of this land, just what would be the condition of things and how much would the Government lose by not taking these farms?

Mr. ANTHONY. I will say to the gentleman the Government has expended about \$6,000,000 in improvements at Benning. We have built a post sufficient to house 5,000 men and 1,000 officers. The construction is 65 per cent completed and has cost a little over either \$6,000,000 or \$9,000,000, I forget which. The Government has built 9 miles of railroad from Columbus to the headquarters of the post. That railroad is built and in operation. If we do not go through with the purchase of this land at Benning—and I want to be frank and say that I was very much opposed to the proposition at the start and would not have approved of the location to-day if it was a new proposition—if we do not go through now with the obligation into which the War Department plunged us without asking our authority, the Government stands to lose almost the whole investment there.

The amount involved in the damages or claims for damages on farms that we have taken possession of, where the owners have moved off and have lost their crops, is as great as the money involved in completing the purchase of the ground.

Mr. HULINGS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANTHONY. Yes.

Mr. HULINGS. What portion of this expenditure has been made since the armistice?

Mr. ANTHONY. I think the greater part of the payments have been made since the armistice.

Mr. HULINGS. I asked what part of the improvements—buildings, and so forth—have been made?

Mr. ANTHONY. Practically all the improvements have been completed since the armistice. The first condemnation proceedings were begun on November 3 or 5, and the armistice was signed November 11.

Mr. HICKS. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. ANTHONY. Yes.

Mr. HICKS. As I understand from the gentleman's report, he was very much opposed to the proposition, and I think he stated a few moments ago that he was antagonistic to this camp site.

Mr. ANTHONY. Originally.

Mr. HICKS. If we approve the purchase of this ground, are we not going to sanction an act on the part of the War Department which was probably unauthorized and not justified by the conditions?

Mr. ANTHONY. It was unauthorized. The main criticism in regard to the location of a basic training camp in the southwestern part of Georgia is the great expense which will be involved in the transportation of troops back and forth to that training ground. If the same terrain could have been found in the central part of the country, it would have been a much more valuable place for training.

Mr. BEE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANTHONY. Yes.

Mr. BEE. Would not the result of the failure of the Government to complete the purchase and the restoration of the land marked in blue on the gentleman's map involve the loss of the whole ground for an Artillery or maneuver camp, interspersed as it is with private farms?

Mr. ANTHONY. Absolutely. The ground which the Government now owns would be absolutely worthless because it would be impossible to fire guns.

Mr. REAVIS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANTHONY. Yes.

Mr. REAVIS. If we approve the policy which was unauthorized, would it not set a precedent that would justify future Cabinet officers in doing an illegal act and put the Government in the situation where to save itself it would have to approve it?

Mr. ANTHONY. The defense of this proceeding is that we were at war at the time this proposition was initiated, and that Congress had placed no string on the money which we had voted and which was available.

Mr. REAVIS. I am not asking what defense the War Department makes. What I ask is if in the judgment of the gentleman we approve of this illegal assumption of authority in this way, is not it an invitation for further conduct of the same character in the future?

Mr. ANTHONY. I think not. I think the publicity attendant on this very Benning matter will be a deterrent in the future to any Cabinet officer intending to make such an expenditure.

Mr. MCKENZIE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANTHONY. Yes.

Mr. MCKENZIE. Will the gentleman state in what direction from the camp the city of Columbus is situated?

Mr. ANTHONY. Right up there [pointing on the map].

Mr. MCKENZIE. Did the gentleman travel over this area?

Mr. ANTHONY. The committee went over the greater part of the area. The night we arrived at Benning there was a terrific downpour of rain and we thought it would be impossible to get out over the land, but they took us there in automobiles, and we went all over it. The character of the ground is a sandy loam, and the heaviest rain does not turn it into mud. That was one of the arguments in favor of it—that it was available for military maneuvers every day in the year.

Mr. MCKENZIE. Whether or not it is true that a number of public roads of long standing lead from the outlying country in the city of Columbus and pass through this camp site?

Mr. ANTHONY. Yes; there are some roads.

Mr. CALDWELL. Only one; the other roads have been abandoned, and this one under an agreement between the county commissioners of the two adjoining counties is subject to be closed up whenever it is being used by the Government.

Mr. MCKENZIE. I am not speaking about roads abandoned or shut up; I am asking whether or not there are not roads that are now open.

Mr. ANTHONY. There are a number of roads; but I saw no highly improved roads on the reservation.

Mr. CRAMTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANTHONY. Yes.

Mr. CRAMTON. Can the gentleman state about what time the Government obligated itself to purchase the bulk of the land in black on the map?

Mr. ANTHONY. The lands were being purchased, or in the process of being purchased, at the time we passed the limitation on the appropriation bill July 11. They started to purchase them

in November, initiated the condemnation proceedings only a few days before the armistice.

Mr. CRAMTON. At the time of the armistice we were not obligated to purchase anything, except that condemnation proceedings had been inaugurated.

Mr. CALDWELL. Yes.

Mr. ANTHONY. The gentleman from New York says yes, but I think we could have stopped the legal proceeding at any time.

Mr. CRAMTON. And at what time did we become obligated to purchase those lands that are in green on that map?

Mr. ANTHONY. Those contracts were made subsequent to the armistice.

Mr. CRAMTON. And prior to—

Mr. ANTHONY. Prior to July 11 last.

Mr. CRAMTON. I may be a little hazy in my recollection, but it seems to me that it was stated to us when this matter was before the House, not only that this was not authorized, but that something in the nature of an understanding or assurance had been given the gentleman's committee that the War Department would not proceed with this matter as they did afterwards proceed. Is not that the fact? In other words, that there was something of a breach of faith between the War Department and the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. ANTHONY. To the best of my recollection there was no promise to our particular committee that no further work would be done. I have been told, however, by members of the Committee on Appropriations that representatives of the War Department had appeared before that committee and had assured them that no further expenditures would be made, but that they were made regardless of that statement.

Mr. CRAMTON. I think that is what I had in mind.

Mr. ANTHONY. It is not my purpose to take up in the time allotted for general debate the merits of the various other propositions in the bill. We will discuss them when we come to them under the five-minute rule. I want to make a general statement, that perhaps three-fourths of the items covered in this bill are for the purchase of land, as shown here, at a good many of the storage depots and manufacturing plants, where the Government has expended millions for improvements and has contracted to buy the land itself—which is common business sense—to go ahead and buy the land to protect the millions of dollars of improvements that we have already placed there, unless the Government wants to sacrifice about half a billion dollars' worth of property.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANTHONY. I yield.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. The gentleman has stated that most of these projects are to save the Government from losing money that it has already expended on the land.

Mr. ANTHONY. Yes.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. For the purchase of the Dayton-Wright plant and real estate at Dayton no money has been expended by the Government as yet.

Mr. ANTHONY. Yes; the Government has an investment there of \$960,000.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Is not that on the McCook Field?

Mr. ANTHONY. No; that is a separate proposition. We propose to abandon it. The Government does not need it, and it is inadequate.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. McCook Field was leased to the Government.

Mr. ANTHONY. Yes.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. That lease expires in 1927.

Mr. ANTHONY. I do not know the date.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I have that information here. Is not the Dayton-Wright plant that they want to sell to the Government owned and controlled by the same people who leased the McCook Field, who now want a release of the McCook Field, which has enhanced in value, and to sell us the other land?

Mr. ANTHONY. I understand that those lands are all controlled by interrelated corporations, all connected with the Dayton-Wright outfit.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. And we are expected to fall for it.

Mr. ANTHONY. I doubt if we do any falling. I shall take five minutes to explain the Dayton-Wright situation, since the gentleman from New York has brought it up. At the beginning of the war it was decided that the Air Service ought to have an engineering and development experimental plant. They went ahead and expended about \$15,000,000 to \$20,000,000 at Langley Field, Va. After they expended all of this money they found that they could not get any of the skilled labor which is absolutely essential in that kind of work, so that the

proposition was a failure and all of these millions had been expended for nothing. They could not get anywhere after they built the plant. Then they moved to McCook Field, at Dayton, Ohio, which is the center of a large amount of highly skilled labor. They leased the old baseball park there, and some adjacent land almost in the center of the city of Dayton, and erected thereon about \$2,000,000 worth of temporary buildings, which they are using as their experimental engineering and development plant. There have been a great many fatal accidents at McCook Field, surrounded as it is by the buildings of the city, where they are testing out machines in process of experimentation. It is apparent to the merest tyro that goes there that it is an unsafe flying field. The Air Service wants to get out of it. The Dayton-Wright people have 5 miles from Dayton a splendid modern factory building, which they erected to carry out their various contracts with the Government. They spent \$1,000,000 for a modern factory building on a tract of land 5 miles from Dayton, in the Miami Valley, surrounded by a beautiful area of flat land, absolutely available for aviation practice work.

We put on top of the Dayton-Wright expenditure there \$960,000, all of which we stand to lose, except \$64,000, the amount which was allowed by the board of appraisers in relation to the amortization, as settlement of their war contracts, unless we take that plant over. It will cost about \$7,000,000 if we build an entirely new engineering plant, and we provided that amount of money in the appropriation bill to enable the Air Service to do it. They can acquire the complete plant at Dayton by utilizing the old Dayton-Wright buildings and purchasing adjoining factory buildings and lands at a cost of about \$2,700,000. There is an economy of \$5,000,000 in the purchase of the Dayton-Wright plant instead of building a new one.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. The gentleman stated that there was about a million dollars' worth of buildings on this land.

Mr. ANTHONY. That is the original cost of the Dayton-Wright people, on the original Dayton-Wright tract.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Yes.

Mr. ANTHONY. I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that we proposed to pay eight hundred and some odd dollars an acre to the Moraine Development Co.—

Mr. LAGUARDIA. And can the gentleman tell me how much the development company is asking for that land?

Mr. ANTHONY. As I remember, it is about \$800.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. And I have a telegram here from the county clerk that the assessed value of that land is \$85.

Mr. ANTHONY. I can not tell anything about that, but I went all over that land in the vicinity of these plants, and I know what farm land is worth, and every foot of that land in the Miami Valley is worth from three to four hundred dollars an acre for agricultural purposes alone.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Better let it be used, then, for agricultural purposes.

Mr. ANTHONY. In view of its proximity to the great manufacturing city, it would be worth the amount of money the Government proposes to pay.

Mr. HICKS. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. ANTHONY. I will.

Mr. HICKS. I understood the gentleman to say they have practically abandoned Langley Field. Is that correct?

Mr. ANTHONY. Abandoned it as an engineering development plant.

Mr. HICKS. Not for flying?

Mr. ANTHONY. They are using it for some minor purposes.

Mr. HICKS. I know the Army has ousted the Navy, and I thought if they had abandoned it we might get it for the Navy.

Mr. ANTHONY. We would be glad for the Navy to have it.

Mr. HICKS. We would be glad to take it. Now, a further question—

Mr. BUTLER. Do we have to pay for it?

Mr. HICKS. We do not. They have ousted the Navy from Langley Field. I notice here in reference to the item for Langley Field they are asking for the purchase of additional real estate and acquisition of oyster rights. Will the gentleman kindly tell me what is meant by the acquisition of oyster rights?

Mr. ANTHONY. One of the members of the Committee on Rules this morning wanted to know if that meant that Members of Congress would be enabled to go down there and get oysters. But the situation is that the Langley Field was used for the development of aerial gunnery and bomb practice, and they found that because of the dropping of bombs from the aeroplanes over the oyster beds that some of the owners of the oyster beds, who had paid the State of Virginia for them, had complained because they were blowing up their oyster beds, so the military authorities concluded that we ought to buy

those oyster beds from the oyster owners before we proceeded with aerial gunnery practice, and we are allowing the item for that purpose.

Mr. LAZARO. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANTHONY. I will.

Mr. LAZARO. The gentleman is a member of the Committee on Military Affairs. Can he tell the committee what his committee proposed to do relative to aviation? How many fields are we going to have, and how are they going to be selected?

Mr. ANTHONY. I could say in a general way the Air Service has organized and picked out about 15 fields, if I remember correctly, which they propose permanently to retain as base fields. Here it is: The Air Service has 12 fields—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LAZARO. Could not the gentleman have a little more time in order to finish answering the question?

The CHAIRMAN. The time is fixed by the rule. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. ANTHONY. Very well.

The CHAIRMAN. Who is to have control of the time in opposition? Is the gentleman from Alabama opposed to the bill?

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, I am not.

The CHAIRMAN. The rule provides that the time shall be controlled by some one in favor and some one opposed.

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Chairman, there is no one opposed—

Mr. FIELDS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. DENT] be permitted to control the other half of the time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Alabama—the Chair does not think that request can be put to the House under the provisions of the rule.

Mr. BLAND of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I object. I am opposed to the bill and I desire to take the time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BLAND] requests that he be given control of the time in opposition to the bill. The Chair hears no objection, and the gentleman is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. BLAND of Virginia. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, there is one important feature of this bill which I propose to discuss. At first it may appear local. It refers to Camp Eustis in the State of Virginia. I realize that this committee is not concerned with a purely local question, and if this were only a local issue I would not take up the time of this committee. The bill proposes to abandon and dispose of Camp Eustis, Va. Its retention is a national necessity. Why do I make that statement? Camp Eustis is the only camp in the United States that is designed for heavy mobile and railway artillery and for the training of forces for coast defense with such artillery. Camp Eustis is located in easy proximity to the only Coast Artillery school that is maintained in the United States. I refer to the Coast Artillery School at Fort Monroe, Va.

I have no doubt that it will be agreed by the members of this committee that the day of fixed defenses is passing. It must be admitted that, as a necessary corollary to the use of railway artillery in land operations in the last war, it was shown beyond a doubt that it was a necessity for coast-defense purposes. I want to call the attention of this committee to the very important fact that of all the camps that have been inspected by the subcommittee of the Committee on Military Affairs Camp Eustis alone has never been visited. The committee has never been on the ground. There is not a line of testimony in its hearings concerning the importance of this camp or its necessity in coastal defense. The members of the subcommittee visited Camp Benning, they visited Camp Knox, they visited the various other camps that are covered by this bill, but they have never been on the ground at Camp Eustis and they do not know to-day anything about the needs of that camp as a military necessity.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLAND of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. The chairman of the committee stated, or, rather, some one stated, that they had traveled 8,000 miles in visiting the various camps. I want to ask the gentleman, even though they traveled 8,000 miles, unless they were military men themselves, how could they tell on a casual visit to a camp whether any particular camp was needed or not by the United States Government?

Mr. BLAND of Virginia. I do not know that I can answer that question, but I think I can answer this question, if propounded by the gentleman, and that is whether any person of average intelligence going to Camp Eustis would decide that

it was a national necessity? I believe that every reasonable person, whether of military training or not, would so decide, and to-day men connected with the Army of the United States would welcome an opportunity to come before the Committee on Military Affairs and tell them of the advantages of Camp Eustis. I have myself personally been before that committee, and I have said to them, "If you do not care to go down at the expense of the Government, I extend to you an invitation to go down to Camp Eustis at my expense and ascertain its advantages." I have been there very recently and I know that it is designed to train men to use the heavy mobile artillery upon moving water targets as well as upon land targets. The proposition that is submitted by the Committee on Military Affairs in this bill is to transfer the heavy mobile and railway artillery from Camp Eustis to Camp Bragg.

Gentlemen, are you training your Army for the invasion of a foreign country? If not, what benefit will follow from your training at Camp Bragg? Our Army is for defense, and our primary aim is that no enemy shall land on our shores. Is not your coast line the logical line of your defense? Is not that the reason why the Congress of the United States has readily appropriated funds for the construction of an adequate Navy? Next in importance to an adequate Navy in the protection of the coast line is the utilization of your heavy railway artillery, moving, as it will, from point to point wherever the attack may come. I submitted as my first proposition that the day of fixed defenses is passing; I may say also that the day of fixed harbor defenses is passing. The enemy, according to reports that would be filed by officers of the Army if there were a hearing on this subject, and according to the conclusion of every reasonable man, may select and will select his own point of attack, and will not choose to send his navy, if he is attacking this country, upon the particular point that you have selected for your defense. If that is true, if your Navy must meet the enemy on the high seas where the enemy chooses, so on land you must meet the enemy where the enemy chooses to make his attempt to land. You have in your heavy mobile and railway artillery moving forts that you may carry up and down your north and south Atlantic coasts. That artillery in part is now at Camp Eustis. By ferriage to Norfolk you are in immediate touch with the entire south Atlantic seaboard. By ferriage to Cape Charles you are in immediate touch with the entire north Atlantic seaboard. By railway through Richmond, Va., you are in immediate touch with both seaboard. You have about forty-two 14-inch guns and many 16-inch railway guns that are under construction. According to present plans all are to be carried to Camp Eustis. There they will be kept for the defense of your coast and at that camp your soldiers will be trained to use these guns. It is proposed, however, to transfer these guns and all operations with them to Camp Bragg, N. C.

Gentlemen, upon what moving targets will you train forces to use heavy mobile and railway artillery at Camp Bragg, N. C., unless possibly upon the jack rabbits that may be found at that camp? Camp Eustis is located on the James River for a distance of, I should say, approximately 6 or 7 miles, possibly longer. It runs along the James River. Adjacent to Camp Eustis and practically a part of it is another firing ground, which is known as Camp Wallace. This camp is located above Camp Eustis on a bluff and on the James River. It is located at such a point that it may fire at fixed targets on Mulberry Island, a distance of 15 miles away. There it is firing over water or land that belongs to the Government, and not over private land.

Mr. MCKENZIE. Does the gentleman assume that there will be any great amount of firing done by these enormous guns, wherever they may be located?

Mr. BLAND of Virginia. I think, if not from the larger guns, there will be firing from the smaller guns, because the very purpose of the camp is to train the men who will be sent there to fire on land targets located as I have described, and, in addition, to train them also to fire on moving water targets as they are towed up and down the James River for a distance, as I am advised by the authorities, of at least 10 or 15 miles and possibly more.

Mr. WHALEY. And is it not the custom at all these forts to have semiannual practice of all their big guns?

Mr. BLAND of Virginia. Of course it is. It is so at Fort Monroe. The guns are fired there at moving water targets. The efficiency of the Navy is due largely to similar practice, for which large sums are expended annually. I will say to the gentleman further, that in addition to the operations at Camp Eustis, there has been established a fort at Cape Henry, known as Fort Story, and it, too, is a part of this training center.

The heavy guns will be placed also at Fort Story, and for the purpose of greater freedom in fire heavy guns on railway mounts

will fire out into the Atlantic Ocean at moving targets. Immediately in touch with Camp Eustis is the balloon school, while only a short distance away—I should say about 27 miles—there is the flying center, known as Langley Field. Camp Eustis is connected by concrete roads with Fort Monroe, and both are under one command. Written reports exist showing Camp Eustis to be an ideal location for the very purposes for which it was designed, but these reports have never received the consideration of the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLAND of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. I was wondering how the distinguished gentleman from Virginia was able to get all of these concessions in his district?

Mr. BLAND of Virginia. I did not get them. These camps were located by the War Department for the same reason that Newport News was established as a port of embarkation and debarkation. The determining factor for each location was its strategic position, and particularly its proximity to the entrance to Chesapeake Bay. I do not claim for myself the credit of having gotten these things. They were gotten before I ever came to Congress, and they were gotten because of the necessity for them.

Mr. JUUL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLAND of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. JUUL. If I understand the gentleman correctly, he is seeking to reinsert into the bill the matter contained in lines 18, 19, 20, and 21 on page 4 of the original bill. Is that correct?

Mr. BLAND of Virginia. I am seeking to reinsert that language, and also to strike out the language that appears on page 7, lines 18 to 25, wherein it is provided:

That no part of the unexpended balances of appropriation heretofore made for the support of the Army shall be expended for construction at Camp Eustis, Va., and the Secretary of War is hereby directed to sell the real estate and buildings of such camp to the best advantage of the Government, the proceeds of such sale to be covered into the Treasury to the credit of miscellaneous receipts.

Mr. JUUL. If the gentleman will permit me—

Mr. BLAND of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. JUUL. Then I am correct when I say that you aim to strike that out and to reinsert?

Mr. BLAND of Virginia. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. HARRISON. I would like to ask the gentleman from Virginia what is the amount of the Government investment there now? How much would it cost to remove it to some other point?

Mr. BLAND of Virginia. I was just coming to that. Without investigation, without going upon the land, with absolutely no information before the committee on which to base its report, it undertakes to strike out Camp Eustis, designed for the purposes I have indicated, and constructed at an expenditure of from \$12,000,000 to \$15,000,000. I understand that the Government has already expended there over \$12,000,000.

Mr. HARRISON. I understand from Gen. Coe, who is the Chief of the Coast Artillery, that about \$21,000,000 has been spent there.

Mr. BLAND of Virginia. I think that is too much. In arriving at the figures \$21,000,000, Gen. Coe includes also Langley Field. The costs of the project at Lee Hall, Va., are: Reservoir guard camp, \$85,960; Camp Wallace (upper firing point), \$1,258,952.50; Camp Eustis (proper), \$11,026,938; a grand total of \$12,371,850. Langley Field is about \$8,000,000. These figures are taken from a report that was recently submitted.

Mr. HARRISON. I understand that, including Langley Field, which is used in connection with the Coast Artillery construction, there has been expended about \$20,000,000.

Mr. BLAND of Virginia. That is correct. But I must hurry on, gentlemen. There are many reasons that I could give why this place should be retained, and I will refer to some of them later. Before doing so I must consider briefly the action of the committee in striking out that portion of the original bill which provided for the payment for land. This provision is contained in certain language which has been referred to by the gentleman from Illinois. It has been said on this floor that this bill is intended primarily to pay for land taken before November 11, 1918, and for which the Government is under moral obligation to pay. I went before the Committee on Military Affairs some time ago with one of these claims, aggregating about \$8,000. If settlements are made in full, the total amount necessary to be paid will be only \$42,000 or thereabouts. When I went before the committee I was given to understand that some investigation would be made. That investigation has not been made. There are no hearings, so far as the Committee on Military Affairs of the House is concerned. However, if you will turn to the hearings which were had in the Senate on a similar bill you will find the exact figures

itemized. There is shown specifically the amounts that ought to be paid for land, and Col. Kuldell says—I refer to page 131.

Mr. LAYTON. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield there, does that include all the lands that were condemned by the Government?

Mr. BLAND of Virginia. Yes. I am going to read Col. Kuldell's statement.

Mr. LAYTON. Where can I get that report?

Mr. BLAND of Virginia. You can get it from the Senate Committee on Military Affairs. I read from Col. Kuldell:

These maps show the location of those tracts. They were not purchased simply because the title was not clear, and it was necessary to go into court to get clear title. The prices were all agreed on, but title is not clear. The names are on the attached list. The tracts are necessary because this is a firing range, and it is not possible to have individual owners own private tracts within an artillery range.

The CHAIRMAN. The facts in connection with all these different details for which authority to purchase is now sought were in the record of the last hearing?

Col. KULDPELL. They were brought out yesterday by Gen. Coe himself. Senator KIRBY. It seems that condemnation proceedings have already been instituted against these tracts?

Col. KULDPELL. Yes, sir.

These items are all detailed on page 131. The particular item that I was interested in was the largest item in the list. I was interested in this item because the former owner had written to me directly. The property had belonged to a lady who was out of possession, having been compelled to move off the land when the property was taken. She has been off the land since June, 1918. Gen. Coe, with reference to the same subject, says:

There are a few parcels of land included within the limits of Camp Eustis which the Government purchased and which has been occupied by troops since 1918 and which had been evacuated by the former owners sometime previous to July, 1918, and we took the whole camp site over in March or April of 1918 and occupied it continuously since that time. There are a few parcels of land within the camp limits in regard to which either condemnation proceedings have not been completed or in regard to which the title rights have not been satisfactorily investigated. The total area of the camp is 7,394 acres, and the cost of the land to date has been about \$600,000.

Col. Kuldell, however, showed that all the condemnation proceedings had been concluded.

Mr. LAYTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLAND of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. LAYTON. I would like to ask what opinion the gentleman got from the War Department in the way of a legal opinion as to the determination and right of the Government to pay for lands that had been condemned and taken over?

Mr. BLAND of Virginia. I have had no opinion from the War Department.

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLAND of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. CALDWELL. The Congress holds the purse strings, and notwithstanding the fact that the executive department is authorized to start proceedings to acquire land, unless we give them the money they can not pay for it.

Mr. BLAND of Virginia. Certainly. Now, I want to proceed.

Provision should be made for the payment of these just and moral obligations. Whatever the ultimate conclusion as to Camp Eustis, these bills should be paid.

But should Camp Eustis be abolished? I will undertake to state briefly many reasons why such action should not be taken.

Camp Eustis is the only home station and school of fire for all railway artillery, now a part of the Regular Army.

The day of fixed defenses is passing, and the need for railway artillery is greater in coast defense than in land operations. Our coast is the logical line of attack and in its defense our Navy constitutes our first line. Our second line of defense consists of heavy railway artillery.

The function of railway artillery in land operations is the destruction of railway centers, ammunition dumps, railway bridges, and fortifications.

The function of railway artillery in coast defense is the destruction of rapidly moving ships at sea.

Distances are deceptive on land, but far more so on the water. When defending the seacoast the objects of fire are rapidly moving ships and smaller craft at sea. To fire successfully on these targets special training is necessary, and for this reason there is frequent practice at forts and in the Navy. There must be moving targets on the water, and battle conditions must be created as nearly as possible. Moving targets are not available at Camp Bragg. That location is remote from the seacoast. Camp Eustis, Va., is the only camp located close to the seacoast. It is ideally located.

It has a large reservation safe for long-range practice at land targets and also at water targets. As the targets are towed up and down the James River, guns located 4 or 5 miles from the shore, occupying concealed positions, may fire at these targets,

from which they are distant 8, 10, or 12 miles. Observers in towers already constructed may direct the fire or report the effect. Observers located along the shore may follow closely the accuracy of the fire.

The guns may be turned in a northward direction and fire upon moving targets in Chesapeake Bay at a distance of 20 or 25 miles. The troops in training may be sent to Fort Story, at Cape Henry, for greater freedom in firing at water targets, and there need be no limit on the scope of their operations.

There are 23,000 feet of standard-gauge storage tracks for railway guns, locomotives, ammunition cars, and so forth, and 90 per cent of the work is complete.

There are 8,000 feet of standard-gauge firing track already provided at Camp Wallace, and material for 5,000 additional feet is on hand for spurs and sidings leading to the various gun positions.

A fire-control system is already provided and nearly complete, consisting of five steel towers, each 120 feet high, and all connected by subterranean and submarine cable with the necessary telephone connections to provide a terrestrial fire-control system, with the work 98 per cent complete.

There is a balloon school adjacent to Camp Eustis equipped to provide balloon observations, all necessary hangars, and so forth, being complete and in operation.

Machine shops have been provided to meet the emergency conditions during the war, and plans are on foot for enlarging these shops to meet all the necessary conditions for a permanent organization.

The camp is conveniently located to obtain skilled labor on account of its proximity to the large shipbuilding plant at Newport News, Va. It is connected by concrete road with Fort Monroe, Newport News, and Langley Field, being about 35 miles from Fort Monroe. It is about 5 miles from the Navy mine depot and about 7 miles from Yorktown. About 5 miles of concrete and 9 miles of gravel and slag roads have been completed in the camp. It has ready water transportation by a 17-foot channel down James River to Newport News, with light draft inland waterway up Warwick River from the camp to James River and near Newport News. It has railroad connections with the main line of Chesapeake & Ohio, so that material and supplies can be placed on storage tracks and alongside of warehouses within the camp, and can be delivered to ship side on pier. It has an excellent pier, which has been built into the James River at a cost of \$500,000. It has ample space in barracks and storehouses for a brigade of railroad artillery under normal peace conditions, and by utilizing buildings and building material on hand, but not required in permanent development, the camp can be converted into a permanent brigade post at a minimum of expense. The number of troops that can be quartered at Camps Eustis and Wallace are 18,750.

It forms a part of a great national training center connected with the Coast Artillery School at Fort Monroe, Va., the only school of that kind in the United States. It is located in easy reach of the entire North Atlantic and South Atlantic Sea coasts. It is located within easy reach of the great naval base on the Hampton Roads, and also of the Army base at Norfolk, Va.

Located near one of the strategic points of the Atlantic coast, Hampton Roads, Va., it is the logical center for the concentration of thirteen 16-inch guns, forty-two 14-inch guns, and twelve 16-inch howitzers already under manufacture for the United States.

The immediate appropriation needed to complete the purchase is only \$42,198.23 for purchase of real estate and \$9,156 to complete incinerator, making a total appropriation of \$51,354.23.

If abandoned, not 15 per cent of the investment will be realized, and the only training provided for railway artillery, will be for operations on land and not on the water.

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, if you dispose of this camp, on which you have expended something more than \$12,500,000, you will not realize one-tenth of that sum. You will lose the only camp destined for the development of your heavy mobile and railway artillery, and so located that troops may be trained in its use on moving water targets as well as on land targets. The location near Fort Monroe has double value considered in connection with the Coast Artillery School there, because the regiments to man the guns would be concentrated upon the camp site near the range. They would conduct fire with aeroplane observers from Langley Field, Va., and with balloon observers from the balloon school at Lee Hall, Va., contiguous to this camp.

The records of the Army, if consulted, will show that when Camp Eustis was located at its present site due examination

and consideration was given to various sections, but they were eliminated from consideration for the reason that none of the other localities possessed all of the essentials.

On the east side of the James River, however, was found this site, which possessed all of the necessary requirements and fulfilled the conditions precedent required for a site for the school of fire. It is close to the aviation experimental station at Langley Field. It adjoins the balloon school. It is close to Fort Monroe and the Coast Artillery School there. Land ranges from zero yards to ten thousand yards are easily obtainable. The location is such that these ranges can be increased from time to time almost indefinitely at a minimum expense. With the long-range firing point located at Camp Wallace, which is the upper end of a huge bend in James River, a 20,000-yard range is secured, and the fire across 10 miles of water reduced the acreage to be acquired to a considerable extent. The territory can be easily patrolled, there being only one road leading to the camp.

The fact that this site possesses so many physical advantages and is so close to the entire teaching staff and theoretical plant of the Coast Artillery School at Fort Monroe argued for permanency, and consequently the lands were purchased or condemned with that end in view.

The same reasons which justify expenditures for harbor defenses and their maintenance justify the continuance of this camp. Yet I am asking now for no additional appropriations except a comparatively small sum to pay for a few acres of land; nor am I asking for the adoption of a permanent policy. All that I ask is that the direction to abandon and salvage the camp be eliminated until you shall have made an examination and until you shall have had full hearings. I do not claim the gift of prophecy, but I do predict that if you abandon this camp you will soon establish a similar camp near the seacoast at a cost equal to, if not greater than, the cost of this camp.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the bill be read.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the paragraph under the subheading "United States Service Schools" under the heading "General Staff Corps" of the act entitled "An act making appropriations for the support of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes," approved July 11, 1919, be, and the same is hereby, amended—

Mr. CRISP. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CRISP. This bill strikes out certain sections or certain paragraphs and provides for the insertion of new matter. My inquiry is, Is that all one amendment, and if so, will the bill be read by sections for amendment, or will it be read in its entirety and then an amendment offered to it?

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Chairman, the situation of the bill is perhaps as the gentleman from Georgia calls attention to. So far as the committee is concerned, it is willing to have the bill read item by item and considered by paragraphs for the intelligent discussion of the Members of the House.

Mr. CRISP. I hope the gentleman will ask unanimous consent. I want to offer an amendment, and some other gentlemen desire to offer amendments, and I have made this inquiry with a view to defining the method of procedure.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair desires to state for the information of the committee that there are two sections to this bill, and that under the rule the bill will be read by sections.

Mr. ANTHONY. I ask unanimous consent that each project mentioned in the bill be considered as a separate paragraph for the purposes of amendment and debate.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kansas asks unanimous consent that each project of the bill be considered as a paragraph for the purposes of consideration and amendment. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Reserving the right to object—and I shall not object to the request—this bill is wholly an amendment to an appropriation act. It is true it is legislation amending an appropriation act. If the appropriation act itself were in the form of a bill before the House for consideration it would be subject to certain rules of the House in reference to amendment. I do not ask the Chair to rule upon that question at this time, but is this bill being considered under the rules of the House providing for the consideration of legislative bills or under the rules of the House providing for the consideration of appropriation bills? Of course, if it were being considered under the rules of the House providing for appropriation bills it would be read by paragraphs, unless the

rule were modified by unanimous consent. If it is being considered under the rules for legislative bills, it will be considered by sections. The question is whether a committee which is bound by certain rules of the House about the insertion of items not authorized by law, or certain items of legislation in an appropriation bill, can bring in a bill to amend an appropriation act and escape these rules. I do not know.

Mr. BUTLER. Is this an appropriation bill or a legislative bill?

Mr. TILSON. Legislative.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. I do not want that to be decided one way or the other by consenting to a unanimous-consent request, though I do not object to the request.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the request of the gentleman from Kansas that each paragraph in the bill shall be considered as a separate paragraph for consideration and amendment. The Chair wishes to call the attention of the gentleman from Kansas to the fact that there is one committee amendment here, a single amendment in which there are several items.

Mr. ANTHONY. My request is that each project be considered as a separate paragraph.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Reserving the right to object, let us know what that means.

Mr. CALDWELL. Yes.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. For instance, on page 3 of this bill is an amendment, or under this request there may be a dozen amendments or more on the subsequent pages striking out certain lines.

Under the request of the gentleman from Kansas is it understood that when the first item on page 3, under the heading of "Infantry," is reached, to strike out lines 8 to 11, inclusive, it is to be considered as a separate amendment and be discussed for 10 minutes or an hour before it is disposed of, and then that each of these other items is to be considered as a separate amendment covering several pages and several dozen projects before we reach the item at the top of page 6 to complete the Infantry school at Camp Benning? In other words, the committee has reported an amendment which strikes out the original language of the bill relating to the Infantry school at Camp Benning, on page 3, and proposes to insert an item on page 6 relating to the Infantry school at Camp Benning. If you are going to consider these two items, do you dispose of the item on page 3 before you reach the committee substitute on page 6?

Mr. ANTHONY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Yes.

Mr. ANTHONY. The amendment proposed by the committee was to strike out all of the words through which lines are drawn and substitute therefor the new paragraph.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. I understand that.

Mr. ANTHONY. And it would be in order to have considered as one amendment the proposition to strike out that language.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. That would be the case under the ordinary rules of the House, possibly, but the gentleman has requested that these items be considered individually and severally.

Mr. ANTHONY. That is, when we reach their consideration.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. That would require the consideration of the amendment to strike out two or three pages before you reach the amendment to insert in place thereof.

Mr. ANTHONY. Undoubtedly.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. That would throw the House into such confusion that it would not know where it was on anything.

Mr. ANTHONY. The committee amendment would be to strike out on page 3 all of the matter indicated.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Supposing gentlemen desired to discuss that, if the gentleman would ask unanimous consent to consider the bill with the committee amendments as an original bill by paragraphs, would not that take care of all the gentleman desired?

Mr. CRISP. If the gentleman will yield, it will, as far as I am concerned, but I think might not so far as some other gentlemen are concerned. I think there are some parts of the bill stricken out that the committee substitute does not refer to in any other part of the bill.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Would it not be in order to offer those items as amendments?

Mr. BLAND of Virginia. That would be satisfactory.

Mr. CALDWELL. Would they not be subject to points of order?

Mr. MANN of Illinois. You can see what confusion you would get into the other way.

Mr. JUUL. May I ask the gentleman from Illinois a question?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Illinois yield to his colleague?

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Certainly.

Mr. JUUL. I would like to ask the gentleman from Illinois if, under the rules of the House as they exist now, it would not be possible, for instance, to move to strike out on page 3 and then proceed to page 6 and substitute the language there, and finish each project as we go along?

Mr. MANN of Illinois. It would not come up as a committee amendment in that way.

Mr. ANTHONY. I think it was the intention of the committee to have the substitute bill considered as the committee bill.

The CHAIRMAN. That does not comply with the rule.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. But that is not the gentleman's request.

Mr. ANTHONY. It was the intent of the gentleman's request, in accordance with the request submitted by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CRISP].

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Would it be in order to prefer a request for unanimous consent that for the purposes of the consideration of the bill the matter submitted by the committee amendment be considered as the original text and that it be in order to substitute for the proposed amendment any of the matter stricken out in the bill?

Mr. MANN of Illinois. That request would cover the case.

Mr. ANTHONY. Under the rules of the House there would be the right to offer any amendment.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Well, let us be perfectly clear about it. If the House has agreed to the committee amendment to strike out an item, it would not be in order without the consent to offer that same item again.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. That is what I had in mind.

Mr. BRAND. That is what the committee is doing; it strikes out some items and reinserts the same items.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. That is one amendment as a substitute.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the request for unanimous consent be so modified as to allow the committee to proceed to the consideration of the bill, with the agreement that the language submitted by the committee as an amendment shall be considered as of the status of original text and that the matter stricken out by the committee as an amendment may be in order in the form of an amendment to be offered from the floor.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Or any part of it.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Or any part of it.

Mr. ANTHONY. That would be satisfactory.

Mr. BRAND. Reserving the right to object—

The CHAIRMAN. Let the Chair state the request. The request is that the bill may be considered on the theory that the amendments offered by the committee shall be considered as the original text.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. And that the proposed amendment of the committee striking out matter may be in order, or any part of it, in the form of amendments proposed from the floor.

The CHAIRMAN. And that any part of the bill stricken out by the committee may be offered as an amendment from the floor. Is there objection?

Mr. LONGWORTH. Reserving the right to object, would it be in order to offer an amendment after one paragraph is read as a new paragraph?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is inclined to think it would.

Mr. LONGWORTH. I will not object if that is the understanding of the Chair.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. I think that would be in order.

Mr. BRAND. Reserving the right to object, then the bill would be read by paragraph rather than by section.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. By sections.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. I couple with the request that it be read and considered by paragraphs instead of by sections.

The CHAIRMAN. And that the bill be considered by paragraphs. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Vermont? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The Clerk will read.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. McKENZIE having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, a message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House of Representatives by Mr. Sharkey, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House of Representatives that the

President had, on December 10, 1919, approved and signed bill of the following title:

H. R. 6857. An act to authorize the change of the name of the steamer *Charlotte Graveract Breitung* to *T. K. Maher*.

#### REMOVAL OF LIMITATION FOR PURCHASES OF LAND AND CONSTRUCTION IN MILITARY POSTS.

The committee resumed its session.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the paragraph under the subheading "United States Service Schools" under the heading "General Staff Corps" of the act entitled "An act making appropriations for the support of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes," approved July 11, 1919, be, and the same is hereby, amended by substituting the words "the Infantry School, Camp Benning, Ga.," for the words "the Infantry School of Arms at Fort Sill, Okla."

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Mr. Chairman, it is unfortunate that the controversy arose on the discussion of the rules concerning certain things that were said in the report on the bill. I for one have never felt and do not feel now that the Secretary of War or any of his agents have violated any law or have done anything that was morally wrong in the matter of the acquisition of these camps and their development. I have studied the matter very carefully and was a member of the subcommittee that visited the camps, with the exception of the one in Ohio and one in northern New York. I was present when the subcommittee discussed the question of whether or not anything wrong had been done by the War Department, and maintained that there was not, and it was agreed that that matter would be left out. I am very sorry that it was put in the report, but that is water that has passed over the mill.

The question is whether we are going to do that which we ought to have done many months ago. Are we going to release the hands of the War Department that we tied at a time when the personnel of the House had changed and it was felt on the part of some Members that we should go slowly in all of these matters?

The circumstances are these: During the war we built up the foundation of a military machine and we were just getting out of the foundation stage of that great structure when the armistice came. When the armistice was signed the War Department was confronted with the proposition whether or not they would throw away what they had, or whether as a business policy we should salvage what we had, whether we should keep that which we should need in the future and turn that which we did not need in the future into such available cash as possible or abandon the whole, and whether we should stop all development at great loss or complete the necessary things under construction.

With that idea in view, studies were made by the highest experts of the War Department. We found that there were 19 camps in the United States that we did not need, 14 of which were National Guard camps and 5 special camps. It was found that in the contemplated preparation for defense of our country, which should be maintained in time of peace, there would be no immediate necessity of these camps upon which the Government had spent in some cases several million dollars.

They were not strategically located and perhaps there was a surplus, and so orders went out to demolish the camps, salvage them, sell the property, cancel the leases, and that was done. It was found in the survey that there were 27 camps that the experts of the War Department felt that it would be wise for one reason and another to retain and develop. Some of them because the investment was very large and we could not get the money out at this time in any other way, and some of them because they were absolutely necessary for the future defense of our country and the future training of our armies. We found in the war that one of our greatest weaknesses was that there had never been any real training of Infantry or Artillery in the United States Army. You could not train infantrymen by having a squad or company of them do the manual of arms sufficiently to enable them to take care of themselves in battle. The art of war consists of two things, to kill the enemy first, and, second, to save your own life if you can in the operation. All the training that the American Army had had, in all of the time in the past except when it was in actual battle, had been limited entirely to teaching the men that skill which would enable them to kill their enemy, and practically nothing has ever been taught to the American young man in respect to how to take care of himself and prevent the enemy from killing him. As a matter of fact, we have held it up to our boys in the past that danger was the thing that they were to accept and to seek, and was such a small consideration that it should not give them any concern. However, now we find it is much cheaper and

much more humane to teach our boy how to take care of himself, and that it will take fewer soldiers to whip our enemy if we do that thing. For that reason Gen. Pershing early in the war began sending cablegrams to the United States insisting that we find here in America some place that would compare with the terrain of the battle fields of France.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CALDWELL. He sent one cablegram, I think, away back in September, 1917. Not having any result from that, he sent another and another and another, until finally in his cablegrams he not only urged that this be done, but he pointed out that the American young man was being trained to defend himself in actual battle, and that they would die by the thousands and the tens of thousands if the American Government failed to give those boys the proper training here to which they were entitled before they were sent away, and he named two men of the United States Army who had had the proper amount of training and skill to put in charge of that kind of a plan, and when his insistence became as hard as it did, and when that cablegram was received here, the War Department ordered that steps be taken immediately to acquire such a camp, and Camp Benning was acquired. We may say the same thing about the camps for the Artillery.

Mr. LITTLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. CALDWELL. Yes.

Mr. LITTLE. What was the date of this cable from Gen. Pershing wherein he told that the soldiers were dying by the thousands because of lack of training?

Mr. CALDWELL. I do not remember the exact date, but it was within two months of the signing of the armistice. I can put it into the Record, for I have it on my table in my office. I can also put in a copy of three of those cablegrams, which I have in my office, and I shall be very glad to do so. The same thing may be said in respect to artillery. Never before in the history of the world had it ever been known that artillery was such a weapon of defense as it is. It has always been recognized as a weapon of offense. It was always used to destroy and tear down the enemy and his embattlements, but never before was the defensive barrage used as it was in this war. When it was discovered that the artillery could be used in that way, and when that great man, Maj. Gen. Summerall, laid down the barrage that thrust the Germans from the battle field, America made up its mind that from that time on it would profit from the brains of Gen. Summerall and never again would our boys go without the protection of adequate field artillery. Then it was designed that we would have a training field on which the Artillery could be trained, a field large enough for the Infantry, the Artillery, the Cavalry, and the tanks, and all the balance. This bill was proposed to carry out the scheme of the War Department. Certain members of our committee felt that they would not be justified in authorizing these enormous expenditures without an investigation personally of the committee. The committee went to a number of these camps. The gentleman from Virginia stated the fact when he said that we did not visit Camp Eustis. It was not on the program and we did not go there. At that time, so far as I am concerned, there was no intention of dispensing with Camp Eustis. I understood that it was as necessary for the Coast Artillery as either Camp Bragg or Camp Benning is for the Army, one for the Infantry and the other for the Artillery. I believe it ought to be kept. I have never been in favor of dispensing with Camp Gordon or with Camp Taylor. I believe those camps are necessary.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has again expired.

By unanimous consent, Mr. CALDWELL was granted leave to extend and revise his remarks in the Record.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, when I first read the report of the committee that accompanies this bill the first thought that arose in my mind was to congratulate the minority members of the committee upon the fact that they had not seen fit to file minority views. I now find, however, that gentlemen on the minority side, part of them members of the committee and part of them possibly not, see fit to undertake to defend the utterly indefensible proceedings of the War Department with reference to the purchase of lands for these camps, and, for my part, if they want to undertake anything of that kind, it meets with no objection whatever. I would like to see any such report. I would like to have it spread before the American people, so

that they could a little more fully understand just what has been going on.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Yes.

Mr. HARRISON. I want to call the gentleman's attention to the fact that the objection came from the Republican side of the House.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I am quite well aware of that, but it did not come from me. On the contrary, I would like to see such a report printed.

The first paragraph of the bill provides in effect for the abandonment of Fort Sill for certain purposes and the substitution thereof of Camp Benning, Ga., which is near the city of Columbus, as I understand it. What are the facts in relation to it? What do we have at Fort Sill? We have some 55,000 acres and a Government reservation adjoining, of which no use is being made, of some 65,000 acres more, where, according to good Democratic authority, if you wanted it not merely for musketry but for an artillery practice you could have 25 miles or more as range for the guns. Fort Sill is high and dry, and upon it has been spent somewhere around \$2,000,000, if not more, in public buildings and improvements.

It was an ample space, ample for all purposes for which Fort Benning was designed.

Mr. CRAGO. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I will.

Mr. CRAGO. I know the gentleman wants to be fair with reference to that, and I think he is largely misled by some erroneous report. Gen. Snow, who is in command of the Field Artillery and also in command at Fort Sill, said:

The Infantry School of Arms and the School of Fire for Field Artillery were both stationed at Fort Sill for a considerable period of time, but it was learned definitely that there was no sufficient room in the Fort Sill reservation to accommodate both these activities. There is no question that if the Infantry School of Arms is returned to Fort Sill, it will become absolutely necessary to move the school to some other place.

The fact was they used the entire area around Fort Sill for a school of fire.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I will say to the gentleman I would like for him to make that statement in his own time if he kindly will. I am making my statement on reliable information from gentlemen who have been to Fort Sill, and I do not agree with the report just read. Some Army officer can always be found who thinks, and probably honestly believes, that the Government should have more land.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa declines to yield further.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I do not agree to the report of this officer. I would like to have the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CRAGO] explain, when he comes to explain, how with 55,000 acres right there and the 65,000 more in the Government reservation, which could be used, that there was not room—

Mr. CRAGO. I was trying to explain. We put in the entire day witnessing the maneuvers of the school of fire, and we were convinced it was no place for an Infantry school.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. The gentleman is easily convinced, it seems to me. I can not go into the details on that, but even if there was not room for the Infantry school what reason was there for purchasing additional ground?

Mr. FIELDS. A great deal of the reservation was so rough they could not use it for an infantry field at all.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. My information is not the same—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to speak for five minutes additional.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Conceding everything these gentlemen say, conceding Fort Sill is not sufficient for the purpose of the school—and I do not concede it, but I can not go into details with reference to Fort Sill here now, as it would take 15 or 20 minutes' time which I do not wish to consume—what happened in reference to this matter? The Secretary of War shortly after the armistice appeared before the Committee on Military Affairs of the House. He asked the consent of the Committee on Military Affairs to go on with this project at Fort Benning and other projects. The Committee on Military Affairs of the House declined to give it. He then went before the Senate committee and asked for their approval. A resolution of approval was introduced and failed to pass the Military Committee of the Senate. He came back to the House and informed the House, according to the record I have, that all proceedings in reference to the purchase of land at Fort Benning had been discontinued, and then the Committee on Military Affairs of the House, satisfied that no further proceedings would be under-

taken with reference to the camp at Benning, gave no further attention to the matter at that time. I understand the Military Affairs Committee contemplated passing an express resolution forbidding any more money being expended in that direction; but about that, however, my information is not positive. As soon as Congress adjourned, what happened?

The War Department went on with its purchase of land at Benning, went on making its contracts with these men, which it is now claimed we must complete. It is now claimed the owners have been compelled to leave the land. If they return they will have large claims for damages. Now, what justification can there be for getting the Government in such a position? If they did not have the land at Fort Sill, they had abundance of land at other places for an Infantry school and Artillery school. There was no need for the purchase of this land at Benning.

Mr. CALDWELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I will, although I would like to finish in the five minutes.

Mr. CALDWELL. I will ask for another five minutes, if necessary.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I do not like to take it.

Mr. CALDWELL. Will the gentleman accept the opinion of Maj. Gen. Wood as to the availability of this place?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Availability of what place?

Mr. CALDWELL. Benning, as against all other places in the United States.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Did the gentleman join in this report? Can he state as to the inaccessibility of Benning and—

Mr. CALDWELL. No; I did not join in the misstatement; I joined in the proposition it was necessary to have Benning. I ask the gentleman again. Will the gentleman accept the opinion of Maj. Gen. Leonard Wood as to the availability from every angle of this camp?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. The gentleman knows perfectly well I have not said a word to indicate that Benning could not be used for this purpose. What I have been asserting was that the Government already had thousands of acres that could be used for that purpose and was not being used, and yet, nevertheless, the War Department insisted upon the purchase of this land at Benning.

Mr. CALDWELL. Will the gentleman take the opinion of Maj. Gen. Leonard Wood as to the availability of any Government land anywhere in the United States for this purpose?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Oh, the general has not expressed any opinion of that kind.

Mr. CALDWELL. I ask, Would the gentleman take his opinion if he had expressed it?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I will not stand here and bandy words with the gentleman. I decline to yield further.

Mr. CALDWELL. He has. Will the gentleman take it if he has?

Mr. CANNON. Will it be a boy or a girl? [Laughter.]

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. The distinguished gentleman from Illinois has given the gentleman the answer to which he is entitled. There are Infantry fire schools scattered throughout the country. I know something in reference to that subject myself. With all the thousand of acres that the Government possesses there seems to have been a determination to locate this camp at Benning. So far as the lay of the land is concerned, it may be well chosen. In other respects it is not well chosen.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Will the gentleman allow me to suggest it is exactly that factor in the lay of the land that determines the military value of any training camp?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Oh, to some extent.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. That is, in view of the topography and not in view of a blue-print paper.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. I wanted to take the time to ask the gentleman from Iowa a question, in view of what was asked, namely, whether there is only one place in the United States where you could train Infantry to fight in a real battle, unless you have an opportunity of selecting the land where the battle is to be fought, confining it to a mere little plain down at Benning? If they were trained there for real battle, could they fight a battle anywhere except at the training camp?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Certainly not. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two minutes on that subject.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent to proceed for two minutes more. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. There is nothing more absurd than to say that you can not pick out more than one place in the United States that is suitable in which to train troops. And there is nothing more absurd to me, though not claiming to be a military man, that training upon some particular location or some

place that is selected by the Army officers is necessary to fit our troops to fight in some other place where the topography is altogether different. Gentlemen talk about rough places. That is where battles are generally fought; but you can find any kind among the thousands of acres now owned by the Government.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. May I suggest this: One of the desirable things about Benning is that it offers the greatest variety of terrain, so that a man may have the experience that may be duplicated in battle anywhere else.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. You have got that at Fort Sill also.

Mr. CRAGO. No; you have not.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. You have at Fort Sill ground both rough and smooth. I insist that the purchase of the Benning tract was a wasteful and needless expenditure of the public money at a time when, of all times, we ought to be economical.

Mr. LITTLE. The gentleman from New York [Mr. CALDWELL] suggested that he has a telegram that he will insert in the Record from Gen. Pershing, which states, as I understood him, that thousands and tens of thousands of young men were dying in France because of lack of military training of the proper character. This was two months, he says, before the armistice, about a year and a half after war was declared. It would appear that we may take it for granted that there were thousands and tens of thousands of men who died for reasons for which they should not have died. If they were dying for lack of military training, and the general is correct, that is the most fearful indictment of the management of the War Department and the training given the men by the officers of the Regular Army and those who helped them that was ever drawn. If that is true, those men who did that training and had a year and a half to do it in should be held responsible. It may be that he is mistaken; that the loss of thousands of young men may have been due to bad management and poor generalship. I have also heard that intimated. At least, I hope the telegram will go into the Record and we will have an opportunity to reach a conclusion one way or the other. If it were due to either, I think it is somewhat remarkable that anybody should come here and ask us to spend millions of dollars to build training camps in which those very officers can turn around and train men again. If during a year and a half of preparation they could not put men on the battle field with the reasonable facilities for taking care of themselves, what sense would there be now in spending money to give them a lot more of camps and more opportunities to train young men to get slaughtered? It does not appear to me as being intelligent.

There is a fallacy here in this argument somewhere that these gentlemen have not accounted for. The conditions they have stated are determinative as against them. If those people failed in their training, they are not entitled to another chance to train a lot of more boys.

It has been suggested that the peculiar topography of this place would be determinative of its value. Of course, there are lots of places in the United States just as good as this, and if this is the only place that is fit, we had better quit.

That is only an observation thrown in for a stopper for a moment. We want to find out whether this specific money ought to be appropriated. I have not ascertained yet to my satisfaction whether it should or not. If they legally bought this ground, and they made the Government responsible for it, I am in favor of paying for it whether it is good or not. If, on the other hand, some fellow, in violation of authority, but with Congress winking at it, violated the law and involved us in a silly expense, but in that way involved private citizens and put them in a position for us to help them, I would go ahead and help them. In either event I would vote for this bill. If, on the other hand, neither condition obtains and yet anybody is injured, it should be settled by some one of the rules under which we authorized the Secretary of War to settle \$4,000,000,000 worth of unliquidated damages, and let them go ahead and settle under that. It can be done. You gentlemen in the Sixty-fifth Congress authorized the Secretary of War to pay out upon his own volition about \$4,000,000,000 to settle a lot of unliquidated damages. I did not vote for it. But if there are a lot of such unliquidated damages at these camps it might be cheaper for him to settle under that. He need not come to us for any more. If there was a moral injury there through our carelessness, I will vote for the bill. But nobody yet has advanced any argument on that point at all that I have heard.

We now approach the question of the value of these camps. That these camps are better than any other camps in which to train soldiers, of course, is not urged very seriously. There are thousands of places, any one of which is just as good as

another. That we should go skipping around the country and spend a lot of money foolishly in building up new camps is not reasonable, either.

You may give the soldier all the training you want to, but you will never know whether he is a successful soldier or not until he has been under fire. There are certain simple things that have got to be taught to every soldier. It takes some time, of course, to do it. But when he has learned that, the rest of it comes in a battle or two, and he is either a soldier or he is not. You speak of special training.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LITTLE. I ask unanimous consent for another five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. LITTLE. If you have got something extra to teach them, who is going to do it? Nobody has taught them anything yet, according to Gen. Pershing's telegram, as I understand it. Who is going to do all this teaching? Where are the boys going to learn anything if they did not in 18 months?

The other day a gentleman came into my office who had served in a regiment in the Philippines, to which he was much attached. He served abroad in the Great War in a Regular Artillery regiment and came home with a good record. He said to me, "Our regiment did not have any better men and did not have as good officers as the old regiment in which I served in the Philippines." "But," he said, "The men were very much better prepared and equipped." I said, "In what way?" He dodged that question half a dozen times. Finally I said, "Confound it, in what way?" "Well," he said, "there were men there who understood wireless telegraphy." That is all he could say. I said, "Good God, we had several good telegraph men and operators in our regiment in the Philippines." That is all he could say.

After you get beyond a certain point, gentlemen, there is very little knowledge of the real art of war to be had except on the battle field, except in certain technical branches like engineering and artillery. But beyond that there is not very much to be taught that can be learned before active service. It has all got to be learned on the battle field. That is where a knowledge of those things is to be acquired. You give me a man who has not had any training at all, and let me throw him into a good regiment, and let him go through two or three battles, and he will soon be a very good soldier, if he has the right stuff in him. That is where the soldier comes from. Every boy ought to have an opportunity before he goes to war to carry a gun and march around and learn to shoot and learn how to take care of himself, but war is like everything else: You have got to go through some of it before you can cut much of a figure in it.

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LITTLE. Yes.

Mr. CALDWELL. If a man can get training for battle by engaging in a miniature battle or participating in a miniature battle and undergoing a barrage, and all that, is not that good training?

Mr. LITTLE. Well, you can explain the principles of physics to a young man in school; also wireless telegraphy; but until he has worked them out in actual practice he does not know anything of value about them. There is no place in the world where a man can learn to be a soldier as well as in an actual battle. It is all right to march around and call out orders on parade, and it looks very fine. And it is all very well to burnish up your gun until it looks fine. But you never know whether you are a soldier or not until you hear the bullets whistling over your head.

Mr. CALDWELL. I do not want to annoy the gentleman, but does he think we ought to have Mexico as a training field and drill ground for teaching the boys to fight? [Laughter.]

Mr. LITTLE. Well, it might help some. [Laughter.]

If some gentleman can tell me what legal right these fellows had and to what we have been legally bound, I will vote for this bill. So far as Mexico is concerned, of course, Gen. Grant and Gen. Sherman and Gen. Lee and Gen. Longstreet and nearly every other great soldier in that great Civil War who received distinction learned everything he knew that was useful on the battle fields of Mexico. That is where they acquired the resources and experience that made them great officers.

But after 40 years of billions squandered on alleged military preparedness this last greatest of all wars has failed to furnish the greatest of all commanders, and the most distinguished of its generals furnishes no name that echoes loud to the trump of fame. The most distinguished soldier alive to-day, the most brilliant military leader now living, is a volunteer soldier of the great Civil War, a general who fought at the head of his troops and knew no tactics that kept him far in the rear. For

no man who marshaled the hosts on the plains of Europe has achieved a reputation to excel that of this last great commander of our own war, the civilian soldier, Nelson A. Miles. What expert has written his name among the stars that illuminate the skies of history higher yonder in glory than our companion of Grant and Sherman and Sheridan and Thomas, Gen. Miles? [Applause.]

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LITTLE. Yes.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Suppose certain contracts were entered into, and the Government agreed to pay money for the property and has not paid for it after the people have given up possession of the property. Will the gentleman vote for the bill to make good those contracts?

Mr. LITTLE. Yes; but I suggest that Secretary of War Baker can settle those claims under the authority we have already given him.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. BLAND of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend and revise my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the gentleman's request?

There was no objection.

Mr. TILSON rose.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Connecticut is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Chairman, I can not quite agree with my friend from Kansas [Mr. LITTLE] that we do not need any training of soldiers in time of peace or that any training that we may be able to give them in time of peace is practically useless, nor am I quite willing to go with him so far in the other direction as to take all of Mexico for a military training or drill ground for the training of our soldiers. What I shall have to say on this bill will be solely from the military standpoint, as to the value of and the necessity for acquiring the property in question as an Infantry school. We now have no Infantry school, except the one at Camp Benning, in the United States. We have a number of Artillery schools—Fort Sill, Camp Knox, and Camp Bragg for Field Artillery; Fortress Monroe for Coast Artillery. Two of them are appropriated for in this bill.

Now, bear in mind that the Infantry is the Army. The other arms of the service are simply assistants, just auxiliaries. The highest service that they can perform is just to help the Infantry. In the first place, the Infantry is two-thirds of the Army in numbers, and in the end the ultimate victory must be put over by the Infantry. In the last analysis of the battle, it is up to the "doughboy." All the others must help him, and they perform most important work in doing so. At the present time we have no fully equipped school in this country for the training of Infantry officers and noncommissioned officers in the vital subject of the use of firearms. We ought to have one.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TILSON. Yes.

Mr. CANNON. Did we not ever have an Infantry school?

Mr. TILSON. We had one before the war at Fort Sill, a fairly well-developed Infantry school.

Mr. CANNON. It is still there?

Mr. TILSON. No. It has been removed from there, and the plant formerly occupied and used has been taken over entirely by the Artillery school.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri and Mr. GREENE of Vermont rose.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield, and to whom?

Mr. TILSON. I yield first to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I would like to ask the gentleman if every one of these camps is not an infantry training school?

Mr. TILSON. In a sense they are, but not schools of fire. Unfortunately nearly all of the camps throughout the country were so located that there was no ground for actual fire practice. It was so in the Spanish-American War. My own regiment never had a chance to fire a rifle until we had been in camp for months and the war was over.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. What did you do?

Mr. TILSON. We did the close-order drill and the extended-order drill on the parade ground and on such other little patches of ground as we could find around the camp.

It was developed in the last war that more than anything else the Infantry needs training in actual firing. They can get some valuable elementary practice shooting at targets on the short ranges, but for advanced training must have the kind of facilities we hope to have at Benning.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. I think what my colleague would like to state is that there is a distinction between the camp

training and the discipline of the soldiers in units, and that coordination of the Infantry with the auxiliary arms which is only to be had in battle.

Mr. TILSON. Oh, yes. The training in the camp is the elementary training which all soldiers must have to begin with.

Mr. BEGG. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TILSON. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio for a short question. My time is very limited.

Mr. BEGG. I do not wish to detain the gentleman, but ex-Speaker CLARK brought out partially what I wanted to ask, and I want to go a step further. Are we to understand that the only excuse for this new Infantry school is to have a place to fire the guns?

Mr. TILSON. Yes, in a sense; if you go far enough in describing what you mean by "firing the guns."

Mr. BEGG. All right. Now I would like to ask another question, if the gentleman is willing to let it rest at that.

Mr. TILSON. The gentleman may ask me a question, and I shall be glad to answer it if I can.

Mr. BEGG. What is the necessity and where is the good business in spending millions of dollars for these three camps in different parts of the United States to take care of training an Army of approximately 300,000 or less, which we will in all probability have, if what the gentleman has said regarding the purpose of this Camp Benning proposition is true?

Mr. TILSON. It does not seem to me that the things referred to by the gentleman have any necessary bearing upon this matter at all. This school is for the higher training of a soldier in the use of firearms. This is where he goes after he has had the elementary training that he received in any of the other camps in the use of the rifle.

Mr. BEGG. Then they take him down there to teach him to shoot?

Mr. TILSON. Not only to shoot but to teach him to coordinate himself with the other arms of the service. At least he ought to be taught to shoot not only at fixed ranges but over varied ground at unknown distances.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Connecticut has expired.

Mr. BEGG. I ask that the gentleman have five minutes more, because I would like a little information.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio asks unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman from Connecticut be extended five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. TILSON. I shall be glad to answer any question that I can, and then I should like to proceed.

Mr. BEGG. The gentleman said that in addition to teaching the soldier to shoot the purpose of this was to teach him to coordinate with the other branches of the Army?

Mr. TILSON. Yes.

Mr. BEGG. I am not a military man by practice or by study, but my understanding is that men are trained to obey orders, and that the officers of the Army know how to function one department with the other without a special place to go down and play this game of war in actual practice.

Mr. TILSON. In my judgment, the proposition as stated by the gentleman is not correct or tenable. I do not believe that any officer or man can learn theoretically by study or lectures anything like what he can learn by actual practice on the field. I believe that it is absolutely necessary to have ground over which soldiers may be trained to meet as nearly as possible the conditions of modern warfare.

Mr. CRISP. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TILSON. I will yield for a question.

Mr. CRISP. Will the gentleman give the committee the benefit of his trip to Camp Benning? He is familiar with that. Will he tell us what he thinks of it?

Mr. TILSON. I shall be glad to do so. I had the privilege of being at Camp Benning for two days, and was thus afforded an unusual opportunity of examining the ground in question. If the committee will bear with me, I shall try during the remainder of my time to give them the benefit of my observation.

Having established the position that we must have a school of infantry—that it is absolutely essential—then there remains only one question: Is Camp Benning a proper place for it? In my judgment, taking it all together, it is one of the best places I have ever seen for the purpose. The nature and variety of the terrain is such that it gives an opportunity for as much and as varied training as any ground that I have ever seen anywhere.

In the first place, it has excellent places for the short and long measured ranges. It is difficult nowadays to get a range, even a limited, fixed range, because the high-power guns now used will shoot over into the next county, so that it is necessary to pick out a place where people do not live in the immediate

vicinity, and that is not an easy thing to do in populous communities.

Next to be considered is the character and topography of the ground. Camp Benning satisfies every necessary requirement in this regard. There is plenty of level land, plain or plateau, for the encampment of troops or for the erection of buildings. There is gently rolling ground for minor maneuvers or for firing unknown distances. There are hills and valleys and streams. There are ravines and short ridges. There are patches of woods and small clearings. There are extensive fields and considerable forests. In fact, the ground itself is admirably fitted for the use of all the arms of the service in connection with the Infantry. Tanks and airplanes can be used, as well as Cavalry and Artillery. Practice on movable targets, a very useful thing for training infantry as well as artillery, can be carried on effectively on this ground.

The soil itself is well adapted to the purposes of a camp or maneuver ground. It is not only sand, loam, and sandy loam, but, as I saw it, there are places where there is clay. There is even swamp land. Some streams have high, steep banks and still others low banks. In fact, there may be found on this immense tract of land stretches of country much like what might be encountered in any rough region where troops might be fighting.

It should not be forgotten that there is an abundance of drinking water, plenty of firewood, and an unlimited amount and variety of engineering material for the use of an army in camp or on the march.

Mr. LINTHICUM. If this appropriation is made, will we get one continuous block of land? Will there be any intervening land belonging to other people?

Mr. TILSON. There will be no intervening land at all. It is contiguous to Columbus, Ga., and I think it monopolizes about half a county there. It is admirably located, near a city of considerable size, and yet there were not a great many people living on the land. There were enough, however, to have produced houses and bearings and roads and other objects usually found where civilized men make their homes. There is plenty of woodland and there are numerous clearings. In fact, there is a terrain as varied as it has ever been my privilege to go over, and there is enough of it so that problems of a complicated nature may be worked out.

Mr. CALDWELL. There is a railroad and a river and a road.

Mr. TILSON. It seemed to have nearly everything that is needed for the purpose intended.

In taking over this land I do not wish it understood that I approve of everything that has been done in connection with it. I leave that part of the discussion to others. I am simply taking conditions as they exist to-day. We must have an infantry school, and I think that this ground will make an excellent place for such a school. We now own most of the land, and, whether we use it or not, will have to pay for it, or more than pay for it, in damages, besides causing our Government to appear in the attitude of abusing its great powers in the unwarranted treatment of unoffending citizens. I am in favor of keeping the land and making a great school there.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words in order to ask a question of the chairman of the committee. My recollection of the statements made during the appropriation legislation for the War Department is that there was a feeling on the part of a few of the Members of the House that there had been waste and extravagance in the purchase of certain property for sites, and that it had gone even further, even to the extent that some officials of the War Department had exceeded their authority. I notice that the committee report before us says, on page 4:

There is no doubt whatever that millions of dollars of the money which Congress voted for the conduct of the war and placed no restrictions thereon have been expended illegally and without warrant of law by the War Department in the purchases of land and the construction of new military posts since the armistice and without the express authority of Congress, as should have been the case.

I would like to support this measure. I have been impressed with the arguments made by the members of the committee as to the desirability of a camp like Benning, but at the same time, basing it on the fact that some of the purchases were made illegally, how are we going to vote for it without putting our stamp of approval on the illegal acts of certain officials of the War Department?

Mr. ANTHONY. The answer to that is that the committee is taking the situation as it finds it, with the fact that these immense plants have been acquired. We have either to take it and utilize it or sacrifice it. If we sacrifice it we place a far greater financial loss on the Government than if we utilize it.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. If we do this, do we not place a premium on and make it more easy for some official in the future to do what the officials have done in this case?

Mr. ANTHONY. I will say that such a condition could only arise if we had another war, when Congress might be swept off its feet and vote large sums, but if such a condition does arise, I, as one Member of the House, would never consent to vote a dollar without specifying how it should be spent.

Mr. BEE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. Yes.

Mr. BEE. The gentleman from Minnesota loses sight of the people who dealt with the Government and who in good faith parted with their property. In other words, to emphasize the argument that the gentleman has been making, he would allow these people to go without any relief whatever, because he is afraid of putting a premium on these acts of the officials which he says is illegal, and yet he would allow these poor people to go without any relief.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. The "gentleman from Minnesota" does not lose sight of the poor people, whether they live in the State of Texas or elsewhere; but the "gentleman from Minnesota" feels that when the committee asks the approval of the House on a proposition of this kind, accompanying that request with the statement that millions of dollars have been expended illegally, and without accompanying that report with a suggestion that steps be taken against these officials of the War Department who have expended the money without authority—if we approve of it without doing anything, they will be doing it for years with the same impunity. I want to ask the chairman of the committee if the committee has under consideration any recommendation to this House to proceed against the men who have acted so illegally?

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. I suppose if any official has violated his oath of office, his responsibility under the Constitution, he can be impeached, but I do not know how we can do more than close the door after the horse has been stolen.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. I ask for two minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. Are we to understand that with the knowledge upon which the report was made the committee proposes not to make any recommendation to this House as to what should be done with these men?

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. The statute law which existed prior to any emergency appropriation for war purposes provides a check against misappropriations of money by any official of the Government. If anyone wants to invoke that law he can do so, and it would provide for this set of circumstances.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact that I was a member of the subcommittee of the Committee on Military Affairs, I hope this committee will pardon me for referring to the little flare-up we had a few minutes ago. I want to say that I did not in the subcommittee approve of the expression "illegally and without warrant of law." I am opposed to its use now. That is a pretty harsh expression. For the chairman of the subcommittee I have the highest respect. In so far as the membership of the House is concerned, there is no Member of the House more thoroughly advised on military affairs than the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ANTHONY]. As a newspaper man, he is one of the best editors of the Middle West. But when a question comes up as to the legal construction of a contract, and whether expenditures are made within the authority of law, I must admit that I would go to some one else before I would take his opinion about it. [Laughter.]

I have seen a number of attorneys who have examined the contracts and who are familiar with the laws under which the War Department operated, and I have talked with them concerning this matter, and they, without exception, have stated that the things that were done by the War Department were not illegal and were not without warrant of law.

I think the committee ought to have been more careful than to use such an expression, because, as a member of the committee and as a Member of the House, having used that expression, and if I thought it true, I would have felt it my duty to have made a report not only to the House but to the Department of Justice that it might institute two proceedings—one for the recovery of the money spent and the other for the prosecution of those who committed the illegal acts. I simply wanted to state my position upon this matter. [Applause.]

Mr. CRAGO. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAGO. Mr. Chairman, on the subject of Camp Benning, I thought the other day that I had brought the attention of the House to the subject in such a way that each man could investigate for himself. I confess that most of our committee went to Camp Benning with a prejudice against it. We were converted to the idea by our actual personal investigation. I do not want anyone to decide a question like this without knowing the facts, and I want to take time to read a letter here regarding this and the Fort Sill proposition from Lieut. Gen. R. L. Bullard. No man stands higher in the American Army, I take it, unless it be the commanding general himself, than Gen. Bullard, the man who led troops in action and who studied this question from every angle. He went to Camp Benning and made a personal study of the project, and here is what he said:

SEPTEMBER 15, 1919.

From: Lieut. Gen. R. L. Bullard.

To: The Chief of War Plans Division, General Staff, Washington, D. C.

Subject: Location of Infantry School of Arms.

I. I was stationed at Fort Sill, Okla., before the war for some two years, and have hunted and traveled over the whole post reservation and wood reservation.

II. I have visited and thoroughly traveled over the ground of Camp Benning, near Columbus, Ga. I have lived a number of years, winter and summer, near Camp Benning and know the climate.

III. I have served 32 years in the Infantry. I was the head of a board of officers for the selection of sites for Infantry schools of arms in France in 1917, and did select and start three such schools.

IV. Neither the post reservation nor the wood reservation of Fort Sill is suitable for an Infantry school of arms for the following reasons:

1. Lack of variety of terrain.
2. Lack of water, streams, etc.
3. Lack of artificial features, like houses and farms, open spaces, places of wood, bridges, etc., which would liken the ground to that over which Infantry must expect to act.
4. Too great ranges of temperature, extreme and oppressive heat in summer and extreme cold with winds in winter, which seriously interferes with training.
5. Inadequate space.

NOTE.—There was inadequate space for the school at Monterey, Calif., and with the Field Artillery School at Fort Sill, there will not be room for the Infantry school of arms, either on the post reservation or at the wood reservation.

6. Lack of natural bullet and projectile stops.
7. Lack of brush, trees, and other material for the construction of Infantry shelter in combat and in the trenches. This is very important.
8. A dry, hard, packed ground, making the construction of trenches, dugouts, etc., very laborious.

And I want to say right there that I think you can get a better view of this proposition when we realize that the men who went down there, Members of this House, and who saw it, instantly changed their minds as to the value of the project and its purposes, and became warm supporters of the project. It is the idea to put a complete division in training there, an Infantry division, consisting of every arm of the service, which goes to make up a complete division, with the aircraft, the artillery, every arm of the service. They have sufficient area there to move that division about, and in that movement to use every arm of the service for a full day, and then go into quarters for the night, and be off again the next morning. Returning again to Gen. Bullard's reason for Camp Benning, I quote from his letter:

V. Camp Benning is the most suitable piece of ground that I have ever set my eyes upon, for the location of an Infantry school of arms, for the following reasons:

1. A very great variety of terrain, including gentle and steep hills, wooded spaces, open spaces, farms, houses, river, great creeks, small streams, etc.
2. Plenty of good water.
3. An immense quantity of brush, trees, saplings, and forest material for the construction of Infantry trenches and shelter in open and in stabilized combat.
4. Soil suitable for the easy construction of trenches and dugouts for the use of Infantry in open and in trench combat.
5. Ample spaces for the staging of all kinds of Infantry combat.
6. Plenty of natural bullet and projectile stops that would prevent danger to the inhabitants of the surrounding country.
7. A moderate climate, which will enable work to be kept up winter and summer, and all winter and summer.

I doubt that another piece of ground equal to Camp Benning for the location of an Infantry school of arms could be found within the limits of the United States.

R. L. BULLARD,  
Lieutenant General, U. S. A.

I want to say that it had rained all the night before the day we arrived there, and yet we saw that in the early morning, notwithstanding the rain, you could have started troops over that area and kept them in motion. It is very rarely that you find that kind of soil over which to operate troops.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman give us the date of that letter?

Mr. CRAGO. That letter is dated just after his return from an inspection of this project, September 15, 1919. Let us look this matter squarely in the face. The project should have been started before it was. It was started early in November, and was in its infancy when the armistice came. The men who owned the

land thereabout were taken from their farms, the schoolhouses were torn down, the churches and little villages were removed from the land, and these men have contracts with our Government, and they should be paid for their land. We have cut this appropriation down from something over \$2,000,000 to a little over \$700,000. We do this in order that we may pay these men for their lands and finish a part of the buildings, and complete the work where 80 and 90 per cent of it is complete, and let Gen. Farnsworth go ahead with the Infantry school at that place. Then, if it is not what we want, we will have done only what reasonable business men would do in a like situation, and have protected ourselves in the investment that we have already made. We have more than \$6,000,000 invested there now, and by an expenditure of \$700,000 we can carry on this project for a time and at least demonstrate its value to the country.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. Does the gentleman know how much money we had expended on this on the 11th day of November, last year, or had contracted to expend and were legally bound for?

Mr. CRAGO. I think practically all of these contracts were let before that. The proceedings for condemnation were started, my recollection is, on November 2, 1918, but that was after they had bought vast areas of this land, and the project of something at Camp Benning had been in process of incubation for more than a year.

Mr. LAYTON. Do I understand that condemnation proceedings makes it binding upon the Government?

Mr. CRAGO. Condemnation proceedings coupled with a direction upon the part of the court and the Government for the occupants to move out. They simply used the war power in driving these men off their farms and out of their homes. Condemnation coupled with that would certainly make us liable for damages.

Mr. LAYTON. And especially where awards had been made.

Mr. CRAGO. Yes; especially where awards had been made.

Mr. LAYTON. And been paid in part.

Mr. CRAGO. Paid in part, that would be legal.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, I have heard the statement made by several gentlemen on the floor of the House that if it could be shown that the War Department had authority to enter into these transactions, or if it could be shown that innocent third parties would be harmed by not passing this legislation, they would vote for it. I wish to call the attention of the committee, therefore, to the testimony before the Committee on Military Affairs of the House last January, when this question was first presented to that committee.

Mr. Crowell, the Assistant Secretary of War, stated to the committee:

I will say we are not asking for legislation, but merely presenting these matters to you for consultation and advice. We have all the legislation now that we need.

At the conclusion of his testimony I asked him this question:

Mr. Secretary, it has been suggested to me that you put into the record a statement showing the authority or the statute under which you acted in making these contracts for the purchase of the sites at Camps Benning, Bragg, and Knox.

He said he would, and included in his statement the following:

There were included in the estimates submitted to Congress for appropriations for the support of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, funds for the acquisition of land for camp sites. Funds were appropriated and are available for the purchase of sites at Camps Benning, Bragg, and Knox under the following: "Barracks and quarters \* \* \* for grounds for cantonments, camp sites, and other military purposes \* \* \*." (Public, 193, 65th Cong.) The Judge Advocate General has held: "There is authority in the appropriation for 'Barracks and quarters' to purchase lands necessary for military purposes, \* \* \* it is the view of this office that the appropriation 'Barracks and quarters' may be legally used for the purchase of the land."

Now that is the authority on which the Assistant Secretary of War told the committee himself last January that he was acting in the purchase of this property.

Mr. MCKENZIE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DENT. I will yield.

Mr. MCKENZIE. The gentleman from Alabama, of course, would not have the members of the committee understand that that construction could be put in peace times; but during the war that is true.

Mr. DENT. I will state to my colleague from Illinois that, as I recall the fact, this particular language, "For grounds for cantonments, camp sites, and other military purposes," and so forth, was new language put in the appropriation bill during the war for war purposes.

Mr. HASTINGS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DENT. I will.

Mr. HASTINGS. What would be the difference in construction in peace times and war times of that particular language? I do not understand the gentleman's answer to the inquiry of the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. DENT. I can answer the gentleman. I did not state that there was any difference in peace or war times. I stated, as I recall it, that this particular language was incorporated in the Army appropriation bill during the war because of war purposes, and this is new language to what is ordinarily used.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. The distinction of the practice in war times and in normal peace times is that in peace times, instead of using those words, we make that language as specific as the English language can make it as to where every dollar is to go.

Mr. MCKENZIE. If the gentleman will yield, and if the gentleman needs more time, I will try to get it for him. Right on this very proposition when we had Secretary of War Baker before the subcommittee on camps and cantonments, I asked this question:

Mr. Secretary, if the course pursued in relation to this Camp Benning were followed in peace times, what barrier would there be between the War Department and the people so far as involving them in the expenditure of public money is concerned?

Secretary Baker answered:

Of course, this could not have happened in peace times, Mr. MCKENZIE.

Mr. DENT. Well, I do not know exactly what the Secretary meant—

Mr. MCKENZIE. Here is the point, if the gentleman will permit me. Notwithstanding the fact that the armistice had been signed, we were not yet at peace and had simply left the door wide enough open to slip through.

Mr. HASTINGS. If the gentleman will yield for one further question. The gentleman, I believe, was chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs at the time this particular language he read was incorporated in the bill?

Mr. DENT. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. DENT. I would ask for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. HASTINGS. When that particular language was inserted in the bill did the officers of the War Department who appeared before the committee and asked for the insertion, in order to justify the insertion of that language in the bill, state at the time that they intended to establish a camp at Camp Benning?

Mr. DENT. They did not.

Mr. HASTINGS. Did they indicate where they were going to establish any camps?

Mr. DENT. There was no specific indication of any location.

Mr. HASTINGS. So there was no specific authority?

Mr. DENT. No specific authority, but they asked for it under the general authority for war purposes. Now, I think, Mr. Chairman, that answers the question as to the authority under which the War Department acted in these transactions. As to the question of innocent third parties who purchased these lands and who were removed therefrom, I wish to call the attention of the committee to these facts. In July—I think July 2, 1917—Congress amended the condemnation laws of the United States by a bill reported by the Committee on Military Affairs of the House so as to provide that when the Government instituted condemnation proceedings for the purpose of acquiring land for military purposes during the war the Government might take immediate possession of the property upon the institution of the proceedings.

Mr. LAYTON. Will the gentleman yield right there and let me ask a question? What obligation rested upon the Government under such circumstances?

Mr. DENT. The only obligation that rested upon the Government was to make this just compensation under the fifth amendment to the Constitution.

Mr. LAYTON. Therefore the Government has the right to pay the awards under those proceedings if they have been made?

Mr. DENT. I think so.

Mr. LAYTON. They can do that or else they can scrap it and return the land to the owners?

Mr. DENT. I misunderstood the gentleman's question. The Government has not the right to do it under the language of the appropriation bill of last July, which we are now trying to correct. It is on account of the language in that appropriation bill that the Government is unable to carry out its obligation, because that appropriation bill provided that no unexpended balance of any previous appropriation or no part of the present appropriation should be used for the payment of money for the purchase of real estate or construction of buildings.

Mr. LAYTON. Is there anything in this bill that repeals the prohibitory clause in that act of last July?

Mr. DENT. Surely. This bill expressly undertakes to do that.

Mr. LAYTON. It covers everything except the specific propositions here?

Mr. DENT. Nothing except the specific propositions.

Mr. MANN of South Carolina. As I understood the condemnation law, the Government had the right to condemn land for war purposes, and the party whose land they condemned had the right to accept the Government's price if he wished, or 70 per cent of it, and then sue for the difference between that and what he thought the land was worth?

Mr. DENT. That was the practice; in many cases—

Mr. MANN of South Carolina. That was the law heretofore. Under this law is it the intention to take from the Federal courts the right to hear those cases that are now pending as to every claim?

Mr. DENT. Not at all.

Mr. HASTINGS. What was the average price that was contracted to be paid per acre for this land or to be given by courts in condemnation proceedings?

Mr. DENT. I was not on the subcommittee that made the investigation of the cases. As I understood the gentleman who has charge of the bill, it was about \$33 an acre.

Mr. HASTINGS. And how many acres? One hundred thousand?

Mr. DENT. Yes.

Mr. HASTINGS. About how much has been paid for?

Mr. DENT. I can not answer the gentleman as to that. I am not familiar with the facts as to those details.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. McKENZIE. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I dislike very much to differ with any of my colleagues on the Committee on Military Affairs, but I do think some of the provisions of this bill ought to be stricken out. One of them, in my judgment, is the section in relation to Camp Benning. I think it ought to be stricken out for three reasons: First, because of the expense that it will entail upon the United States in the transportation of officers and the supplies to this camp, located in the extreme southeastern part of our country and far from the centers of population; second, I think it ought to be stricken out as a rebuke to the men who had the nerve to put a proposition of this kind over without coming to Congress for the authority to act; third, I think it ought to be stricken out as a matter of justice to the poor people who live in that community. And I want to say that I am saying these things without prejudice on account of the location of this camp. I do not question but that it is located in a very desirable terrain, so far as that is concerned, over which to maneuver, and to engage in Infantry arm practice. I do not question those things at all. I think they are all true. But I do question the authority of a few men in the real estate division of the War Department going into a deal of this character when any man that had had vision enough to see across the street knew that the war was about at an end.

And I would like to see it stricken out because of the fact that when the armistice was signed not an acre of this ground had been bought and paid for. But when the news flashed over the wires to Columbus, Ga., and to Camp Benning, that the armistice was signed, these men, some of whom were in the uniform of the United States, went, to their discredit, to the citizens of that county and said to them: "Sell your land now and take your money, because if you do not take it now condemnation proceedings are hanging over you and you may not get your money for as long a time as it took to get money for cotton claims after the Civil War."

And they asked the men whose titles were defective to take the money and put it in the bank and hold it there until their abstracts were perfected. And I think we ought to strike out this clause for no other reason than to rebuke that conduct on the part of the Government.

Mr. CARAWAY. Would not our refusal to enact this law make it impossible for the people to get their money?

Mr. McKENZIE. No, sir. This Congress passed a law, and perhaps with a good deal of fear—at least I had a good deal of fear in my bosom when I voted for the law—permitting the War Department to settle contracts which were illegal in form, and under which law I fear much has been lost to the Government of the United States. But in order to protect our citizens who had entered into contracts honestly we passed that law. As the Secretary admitted before our committee, that law takes care of these men in Georgia whose land had been taken by the Government.

Mr. JOHNSON of Mississippi. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McKENZIE. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Mississippi. That applied only to unliquidated claims, did it not? These claims are liquidated and the amount has been ascertained.

Mr. McKENZIE. So much greater is the responsibility of the Government to pay them damages. Far be it from me to argue for any proposition that would injure a citizen of Georgia.

Mr. BEE. Would not the result of the gentleman's contention drive the owners of the land in Georgia into the Court of Claims or to Congress for an appropriation to reimburse them?

Mr. McKENZIE. It may be we can remedy that.

Mr. BEE. When?

Mr. McKENZIE. Any men who have a sense of justice in their hearts can pass a law in 24 hours in this Congress taking care of such a case as that.

More than that, I want to say, gentlemen of this House, that only three days ago I talked with a reputable citizen of the State of Georgia who came into my office to see me about this matter, and he assured me that 80 per cent of the men who owned the land on this tract would gladly take it back at the price that the Government offered to pay for it, but that the people living in the city of Columbus, perhaps under the domination of the Columbus Chamber of Commerce and those men at this camp there, would not do so. But that would not justify us in keeping 80 per cent of these people out of their homes.

I want to call your attention to another thing. It is a simple matter, but in it are the germs of justice. This community in Georgia is an old community. It is situated along the Chattahoochee River. The Chattahoochee River is navigable as far as the city of Columbus. One hundred and fifty years ago and more pioneers came into that territory, settled there, made their homes there, carved out their little fortunes on the hillside in that little county of Chattahoochee. There they raised their families, and there they buried their fathers, there they erected their cemeteries, there they put up their schoolhouses, and there they built their churches. Along comes the Government of the United States, led by a few petty officers in the Military Establishment, walks in there and slams down a condemnation suit to take 100,000 acres away from those American citizens in time of peace, to drive them from their homes, to scatter them over the country and remove them from the places where they had lived for generations, and where they had buried their forefathers, with everything that was dear to them taken away from them, and they driven out by the Government of the United States in time of peace.

I want to say to you, gentlemen, in my judgment, no such outrage has ever been perpetrated upon free men since the time the British drove the poor Acadians on their ships at the point of the bayonet and scattered them along the Atlantic coast, out of which outrage grew that beautiful story of Evangeline.

Mr. CRAGO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. McKENZIE. Yes.

Mr. CRAGO. I will say to the gentleman that the people of the county he speaks of as having been driven from their homes are only anxious for Congress to pay them for the land that has been taken. The county in which most of this land lies was carved out only a few years ago to satisfy certain political ambitions in that neighborhood, and it is the people in that small county who are left in the still smaller county who are objecting. [Applause.]

Mr. McKENZIE. Well, I will state to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that if that statement is true, the distinguished gentleman from Georgia who came into my office is a liar. But he looked to me like a truthful and honest man. [Applause.]

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McKENZIE. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. McKENZIE. Mr. Chairman, may I have two minutes more?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent to proceed for two minutes more. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LINTHICUM. The gentleman stated that he would let these people come in with a bill for their claim, if they had any, against the Government and return this land.

I want to ask if the gentleman remembers one gentleman from Illinois speaking a while back of the McCormick claim, a small post-office matter, that had been here since the administration of Grover Cleveland, and that they had just passed a few weeks before? Does the gentleman remember that circumstance, and would he let these people wait and wait on for their money indefinitely?

Mr. McKENZIE. No. I want the gentleman from Maryland to understand that I am no more in favor of defrauding any one of these individual citizens of the State of Georgia than I would be in favor of defrauding a man in my own home town; not for a minute; and, feeling as I do about it, the reason why I denounce this thing is that in my judgment it was the greatest outrage and fraud ever perpetrated in the United States, notwithstanding it is a fact that it is a good place to have an Artillery school or a military instruction field. Consider the way in which it was conceived in iniquity and carried out over the protests of the Congress of the United States, when the Senate of the United States had told them to cease. Notwithstanding that, they went on and carried it out, and now we are called upon to ratify that sort of conduct.

Mr. LINTHICUM. I am talking about these people whose lands were taken, whose courthouse was taken, and whose schoolhouses were taken.

Mr. McKENZIE. They will get justice.

Mr. HASTINGS. Is the gentleman in favor of returning them to them?

Mr. McKENZIE. Absolutely.

Mr. ROBINSON of North Carolina rose.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina is recognized.

Mr. ROBINSON of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I want to present a few facts to this House in behalf of the people of Camp Bragg who have been driven from their homes. I am not here representing the War Department nor the good people of the city of Fayetteville who are anxious for the establishment of this camp, but the property owners there who have been driven from their homes, from their all, and who have not received one cent from the Government in payment for their property.

The territory embraced within Camp Bragg is about 75 per cent of it located in the county of Hoke, which is one of the counties composing the district which I have the honor to represent. They get none of the benefits from the establishment of the camp, but they have suffered most of the inconveniences that have arisen by reason of its having been established.

As I understand it, the Government, through the War Department, seeking a place to establish an artillery camp, went down there and selected this territory without being invited to do so by the citizens who owned the property embraced within the camp. My information from the War Department is that the Government has purchased and paid for 50,537 acres. It has contracted for 9,177 acres, leaving 60,739 acres now under condemnation proceedings. Gentlemen, the lands which they have purchased and which they have contracted for are located all over the territory embraced within the limits of the proposed camp.

They have destroyed the community interest. The churches have been torn down, the schoolhouses have been torn down, the roads have been abandoned, and it is now in an uninhabitable condition, even if the property owners could be restored to the position they were before the Government took charge. The land which they have not bought or contracted for the owners of it have been directed and ordered by the War Department to vacate, and told that if they planted their crops they could not reap them.

Mr. BUTLER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBINSON of North Carolina. Yes.

Mr. BUTLER. I thank the gentleman very much for yielding. I wish to ask him, When was this desolation created? That will largely influence my vote upon this bill. I do not want these people to suffer—

Mr. ROBINSON of North Carolina. They have already suffered.

Mr. BUTLER. Can they be restored?

Mr. ROBINSON of North Carolina. They can not be restored to their property.

Mr. BUTLER. When was this property taken from them and destroyed—about what time?

Mr. ROBINSON of North Carolina. I have not the exact dates, but they were ordered to move out in the latter part of the year 1918.

Mr. BUTLER. After the armistice was signed?

Mr. ROBINSON of North Carolina. A large number of them were ordered to move out before the armistice was signed and a considerable number afterwards.

Mr. BUTLER. Was this desolation made there since the armistice was signed—this destruction?

Mr. ROBINSON of North Carolina. I am not prepared to say. Probably some members of the subcommittee can give the gentleman more definite information than I can.

I will state to you gentlemen that this property is all these good people had. They have been driven from their homes. They have not received the money that the Government promised to pay them and can not buy homes elsewhere.

Mr. JOHNSON of Mississippi. Is it not a fact that a great many of them have purchased homes elsewhere and contracted to purchase homes elsewhere?

Mr. ROBINSON of North Carolina. I was coming to that. A large number of them, relying upon the representations of this great Government that they would have their money in a short time, went elsewhere and contracted for homes, and have been unable to meet those obligations.

Mr. BUTLER. How many of them were there?

Mr. ROBINSON of North Carolina. I have not the exact number.

Mr. BUTLER. As many as a hundred?

Mr. ROBINSON of North Carolina. Several hundred.

Mr. BUTLER. Property owners?

Mr. ROBINSON of North Carolina. Five or six hundred property owners, as this property was owned by small landowners largely.

Mr. GODWIN of North Carolina. Is it not a fact that they were ordered out of there in the summer of 1918?

Mr. ROBINSON of North Carolina. I do not know the exact date, but I know they were ordered to vacate the premises.

Mr. GODWIN of North Carolina. That is true. They were ordered out about the middle of the summer.

Mr. ROBINSON of North Carolina. My colleague from the sixth district is more familiar with the fact than I am.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ROBINSON of North Carolina. I ask unanimous consent for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina asks unanimous consent that his time be extended five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CARAWAY. So far as the injury inflicted upon these people is concerned, it does not make any difference whether it was before or since the signing of the armistice.

Mr. ROBINSON of North Carolina. Certainly not. I cannot see that that makes any difference.

Mr. CARAWAY. They obeyed the orders of their Government.

Mr. ROBINSON of North Carolina. They obeyed the orders of their Government, and I want to state here that no graft has been inflicted on the Government in the contracts which have been entered into for the purchase of this land. The land paid for cost the Government \$18.62 an acre.

Mr. WELLING. If the bill is passed, will that correct the evil you are speaking of?

Mr. ROBINSON of North Carolina. It will correct it in part.

Mr. WELLING. You are in favor of the bill?

Mr. ROBINSON of North Carolina. Yes; I am in favor of the bill, because that is the only manner in which they can get any relief at all.

I was going on to state that the land which was purchased and paid for cost the Government \$18.62 an acre. My information is that the landowners received something like \$16 an acre.

Mr. HASTINGS. Was that the contract price, or was that determined in condemnation proceedings?

Mr. ROBINSON of North Carolina. That which the Government contracted for and paid for and that which was condemned also.

Mr. HASTINGS. That was the average price?

Mr. ROBINSON of North Carolina. That was the average price which it cost the Government, but the landowner did not get all that sum. My information is that there are 700 different tracts embraced within this camp, and the Government sent its surveyors and surveyed each tract and procured an abstract, and the Government had to pay this cost in addition to the price it paid to the landowner.

So it cost the Government the sum of \$18.62 per acre for the land which they have paid for, which they have contracted for, and the land the owners of which were driven from the premises is at a contract price of \$12.09 per acre, leaving 60,739 acres now under condemnation proceedings.

Mr. HASTINGS. Have condemnation proceedings on any tract been finally determined?

Mr. ROBINSON of North Carolina. I am not advised as to that. Gentlemen, in my opinion—and I am not here representing the War Department—that, as a matter of business, it is to the interest of the taxpayers of this country that the Government go ahead and complete these contracts of purchase for

this land and pay these people, and then, if it is not to the interest of the Government to maintain it as a camp, they can cut the land up in tracts of 100 or 200 acres, sell it, and make a profit on their investment. Land in that county, since the land was taken from these people and contracts entered into, has increased in price 50 per cent, not only in this particular section but all over the cotton belt.

I bought a small tract of land for \$37.50 per acre about February 1, 1919, and I was offered a few days ago \$75 per acre. That is on account of the high price of cotton and the fact that they made a good crop of cotton in that locality.

Mr. REAVIS. If the gentleman will yield, if that land has increased so much in value, how would the people suffer if you gave it back to them?

Mr. ROBINSON of North Carolina. I tried to make that plain a few minutes ago. The Government owned land dotted all over this territory; they have torn down the churches, they have torn down the schoolhouses, and the roads have been abandoned and the community interests destroyed. It is not a fit place to live. If the Government should go ahead and complete the contracts, secure the entire acreage within the camp and then cut it up into tracts and sell it the community, interests could be established and it would be a fit place to live. [Applause.] Under the present conditions the citizen who has not sold his land to the Government is surrounded by lands owned by the Government, with no roads, no churches, no schools, and, in fact, no community interest, and his home and land is not a desirable place to live, and his property under the conditions brought about by the Government is valueless.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. All pro forma amendments are withdrawn, and the Clerk will read.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Chairman, I think there was a motion to strike out the section.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair regarded that as a pro forma amendment.

Mr. HASTINGS. Then I move to strike out the section.

Mr. BEE. The effect of that would be to kill the bill.

Mr. HASTINGS. No; it is not the enacting clause.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Oklahoma to strike out the section.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. HASTINGS) there were 3 yeas and 47 noes.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 2. That the third paragraph under the heading "Reserve Corps" and subheading "Ordnance Supplies for Military Equipment of Schools and Colleges" of the act entitled "An act making appropriations for the support of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes," approved July 11, 1919, be, and the same is hereby, amended to read as follows:

"That no part of any of the appropriations made herein nor any of the unexpended balances of appropriations heretofore made for the support and maintenance of the Army or the Military Establishment shall be expended for the purchase of real estate or for the construction of Army camps or cantonments, except in such cases at National Army or National Guard camps or cantonments which were in use prior to November 11, 1918, where it has been or may be found more economical to the Government, for the purpose of salvaging such camps or cantonments, to buy real estate than to continue to pay rentals or claims for damages thereon, and except where industrial plants have been constructed or taken over by the Government for war purposes, and the purchase of land is necessary in order to protect the interest of the Government: *Provided*, That there may be expended for the purposes hereinafter specified, from the unexpended balances of appropriations heretofore made for the support and maintenance of the Army or the Military Establishment which are available for such purposes, and, when any such balances are exhausted, from the appropriations made for such purposes under this act, the several sums as follows:

"INFANTRY.

"To complete the Infantry school at Camp Benning, Ga.: For the purchase of real estate, \$515,252; for construction and to complete buildings now in process of construction, \$250,000; total for Infantry school, \$765,252: *Provided*, That no part of the unexpended balances of appropriations heretofore made for the support of the Army shall be expended for construction at Camp Gordon, Ga., and the Secretary of War is hereby directed to sell the real estate and buildings of such camp to the best advantage of the Government, the proceeds of such sale to be covered into the Treasury to the credit of miscellaneous receipts.

Mr. CRISP. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment. The Clerk read as follows:

On page 6 strike out lines 5 to 12, inclusive.

Mr. CRISP. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia asks unanimous consent that he may speak for 10 minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRISP. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlemen of the committee for granting me an extension of time, but I will not take all of it. The effect of the amendment I have offered is

to strike from the bill the provision which directs that Camp Gordon be sold, salvaged, and the money put into the Treasury of the United States. I know that the Committee on Military Affairs is a very painstaking committee, and no man in the House has more respect or greater confidence in it than I have. In the main, I am heartily in favor of their report. I want to say at the outset that neither Benning nor Gordon are in my district. As a Georgia Representative, I am naturally interested in these projects, and I know the committee is acting wisely for the Government in reporting that the Infantry school at Camp Benning be completed. I am not going to take up the time of this committee in discussing that, for I think the mind of the committee is made up favorable to the project.

But I do want to say that, as a Georgia Representative, I have only received two protests from any of those so-called simple-minded citizens of Georgia protesting against their being removed from the premises embraced in Camp Benning. As to Camp Gordon, I appeal to you, my fellow colleagues, to let that camp remain. This bill is not asking any money from the Government for the purpose of completing or continuing Camp Gordon. I want to call your attention to some facts. The Government has expended in the erection of Camp Gordon \$11,218,000. They have housing for 41,162 soldiers. They have 11,303 acres of land. It is one of the seven division posts which the Government has. At this post they have a hospital, sewerage, and it is a complete city, capable of caring for 41,000 people. The Government has had some experience in salvaging Army camps. I think you will find if you investigate that where they have been salvaged the Government did not realize as much as 15 per cent on the cost. I know that Nitro, situated in West Virginia, upon which the Government spent in the neighborhood of \$70,000,000, when it was sold the Government only realized about \$8,000,000.

Mr. EVANS of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRISP. Yes.

Mr. EVANS of Nebraska. Does the gentleman advise that we should not have sold Nitro, but should have kept it and gone on with it?

Mr. CRISP. I do not. I am not familiar with that proposition, but I do advise that we should retain Camp Gordon, and why do I say that? We all hope, of course, that wars are a thing of the past, but I apprehend that this Government is not going to do away entirely with preparations, for we must be prepared in the event that we should unfortunately become involved in war in the future. If that is true, we must have some posts where training can be given to our soldiers. Here is a complete city, centrally located. It is located almost in the center of the South, near a metropolitan city, with magnificent railroad connections, going all over the South, leading to the East and the West, accessible from all parts of the East and the South. It is easily accessible to the Atlantic ports and to the Gulf ports. You know that this Government is going to have some kind of military training, and, if so, you must have some posts where these troops can be concentrated and trained.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRISP. Yes.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. Has the gentleman ever been at Camp Gordon?

Mr. CRISP. I have never been at the camp. I have passed through it numerous times on the railroad, going back and forth from Washington to my home.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. Has the gentleman ever asked anybody whether there was any place there where they could train troops?

Mr. CRISP. I have, and I asked the War Department officials and they say they want it kept. They say it is suitable, and let me say—

Mr. HULL of Iowa. Will the gentleman quote the War Department official who says that men can be trained and drilled there?

Mr. CRISP. Oh, I have not gone into detail with any particular War Department official.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. We have been all over the ground, and we could not see where you could train and drill a regiment of troops.

Mr. CRISP. I will say to the gentleman that one of the most magnificent divisions, a division that reflected honor and glory upon this country at San Mihiel and the Argonne Forest in France, the Eighty-second Division, composed of New York, Massachusetts, and southern boys, were trained at Camp Gordon. [Applause.]

Mr. HULL of Iowa. Were they not trained abroad?

Mr. CRISP. No; they were trained at Camp Gordon for a year before they went over there. I had two nephews myself who were trained there before they went over. This camp is

not in Georgia simply because it is in the South. I say to you that the southern Representatives knew nothing about the camp being located there until it came out in the newspapers, and I will tell you who selected it. It was Gen. Leonard Wood. He was commander of the Department of the Southeast when we went into the war. He went over the country and he viewed the various spots and he selected these camps, and many of them were placed in the South for the very common-sense reason that the climate is warmer and that you have many more months in the year when you can train soldiers than you can where the climate is colder. That is why these camps were placed there. I doubt not that the War Department in the coming summer will want to give the National Guard military training. There must be some post to house them where they can get this training.

If Congress should pass a law providing for compulsory military training you must have Army posts, and I appeal to you, gentlemen, as a common-sense proposition, where you have this camp that will house 41,000 soldiers, that it ought to be retained. We are not asking any money for it. Why salvage it when you would get only about 10 or 15 per cent of its value?

Let me urge another reason why you should adopt my amendment, and I shall close. The General of our Army, Gen. Pershing, is to-day in Atlanta inspecting this camp. This Congress has shown confidence in Gen. Pershing because it has made him a full general. I ask you to defer directing that this camp be salvaged until you hear Gen. Pershing's report. If you adopt my amendment and strike this out when the bill goes to the Senate, you will have ample time to get Gen. Pershing's report, and if he reports that it should be salvaged and destroyed, I for one will be happy to acquiesce in his superior judgment.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that his time be extended for one minute. I want to ask him a question.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUTLER. In the gentleman's opinion is it necessary for us to have both Camps Benning and Gordon?

Mr. CRISP. I answer yes, because they are used for entirely different purposes.

Mr. BUTLER. Is not Camp Gordon an Infantry camp?

Mr. CRISP. It was one of those general cantonments where Infantry was trained, as was done at all of these cantonment camps.

Mr. BUTLER. I note that Benning was also an Infantry camp.

Mr. CRISP. Benning is a school of Infantry. I will say to my good friend from Pennsylvania that the Government on its own volition, without any representation from us, moved the school of Infantry from Fort Sill to Fort Benning on account of its superior qualifications, and it is to be a permanent school for instruction. These others are emergency or regular cantonments.

Mr. BUTLER. I thank the gentleman. [Applause.]

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GARRETT. I want to see just where we are and in what shape we are in the consideration of this bill. Did the Clerk read that part of the bill beginning in line 8, page 3?

The CHAIRMAN. No; under the unanimous-consent agreement entered into it was understood that the language in italics would be considered as original matter and that the language of the bill which is stricken out would be subject to amendment later and was not to be read.

Mr. GARRETT. That was a unanimous-consent agreement?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Chairman, in considering the matter of appropriations for these new camps which we are creating, the committee has made the first attempt to compel the War Department to salvage and realize upon some of the Army camps and cantonments which were built during the war, for which we think there is no emergency in continuing. One of the best examples of that is at Camp Gordon, where the committee provides it shall be abandoned and salvaged and sold and the money placed in the Treasury. It was located 16 miles from Atlanta in a hilly country. It perhaps served its purpose as a place for the mere mobilization of troops. It houses 50,000 men, but there is practically no ground which is afforded there to train troops to make soldiers, and there is hardly ground upon which a company can be formed. There is not even a rifle range there, and I can not conceive of any military authority recommending the retention of Camp Gordon as a permanent

military establishment at all. The land is very valuable, the buildings can be salvaged for a round sum of money. We are about to embark upon an enterprise which will cost us millions of dollars located just 85 miles to the south of it, where we provide for a basic Infantry training school of the Army, and if we are going to make a beginning in doing away with some of these tremendous overhead expenses, which they are trying to perpetuate in the Army which we inherited from the Army, Camp Gordon is a good place to begin to economize and wipe out and put the money in the Treasury.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANTHONY. I will.

Mr. LONGWORTH. I understand there are only about 2,000 acres at Camp Gordon, whereas there over 75,000 at Camp Benning.

Mr. ANTHONY. Ninety-seven thousand at Camp Benning.

Mr. LONGWORTH. There is no parallel between the two?

Mr. ANTHONY. There is absolutely no parallel. There is no ground whatever available for training at Camp Gordon. In the proximity of Atlanta are located many important military enterprises. Fort Oglethorpe is a few miles to the southwest, Fort McPherson is located in the city of Atlanta, and Camp Jessup, where a \$3,000,000 motor transport-repair shop is located.

Mr. BUTLER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANTHONY. I will.

Mr. BUTLER. Has the gentleman any figures as to how much all this cost the Government at Camp Gordon?

Mr. ANTHONY. I can not state, but if the figures of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CRISP] are correct, there has been fully \$10,000,000 invested there. It is of temporary construction; the typical frame cantonment buildings—

Mr. BUTLER. How much does the gentleman imagine we can sell it for?

Mr. ANTHONY. I think we would realize 15 per cent on the cost of the buildings and every dollar on the cost of the land.

Mr. BUTLER. Most of the expense, of course, was putting up the buildings?

Mr. ANTHONY. I think that is correct.

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Mr. Chairman, this is not even a surplus property. If Camp Gordon were a surplus camp all that has been said in favor of the committee amendment would be justified. But it is not a surplus camp. The board of officers appointed to decide as to how much war material should be retained and how much salvaged decided that we should provide for nine divisional camps, and of those nine divisional camps Camp Gordon is one. There was wisdom in the decision of this board of the War Department. If we take the standards of wisdom of the majority of the Committee on Military Affairs that has reported this amendment over the protest of some of us who can not agree if we take their opinion as the standard as to whether or not we should have nine divisions, I refer you to the fact that the Army reorganization bill, which we have recently taken up for consideration, starts out with the proposition that we are going to have nine divisions.

If you have nine divisions and you throw away one of the divisional camps, what are you going to do to house one division of American soldiers? You have got to have a home for them. They already have—

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CALDWELL. Excuse me, inasmuch as I have only five minutes.

They already have a home, and it is located near a great city, and all the Army men say that camps of this character, in order to be a success and to keep the boys happy, must be within short distances of great cities. The terrain here is most admirable for an army camp. It is the best drained camp that we saw, and it is in better condition than anyone we visited in all our trip.

Now, they say there is no land there to train the men; that you can not get them out to parade or train them to shoot, but it is only a little way to Camp Benning, which is the place where the great training is to come for the Infantry soldiers, and is close enough so that you do not even have to put them on a railroad train, but you can march them across country and give them that training at the time they are going to get the training that they need in the field. It would be folly for us in the Military Committee to write a law that was going to handicap military experts of our country who have devoted their whole lives to the development of a military arm, and say to them "You shall not have this and shall not have that," when we already have it, and it will not cost us anything. Why should we destroy that which they have been trying to build up.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CRISP].

The question was taken, and the Chair announced that the noes seemed to have it.

Mr. CRISP. Division, Mr. Chairman.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 34, noes 51.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

MOTOR TRANSPORT CORPS.

To complete motor transport schools as follows:  
At Camp Holabird, Md.: For the purchase of real estate, \$140,000.

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. GOODYKOONTZ. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I think we ought to have a quorum from now on.

Mr. ANTHONY. Will the gentleman from Texas withhold a moment? I want to say that after the statement of the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. GOODYKOONTZ] I shall move to rise.

Mr. BLANTON. All right.

Mr. GOODYKOONTZ. Mr. Chairman, I realize the fact that the committee is dealing with an important subject, but I have one of more importance. I have one that concerns the fuel supply of the country, one that involves the delivery of coal to the American people who are cold and shivering. The urgency of the situation justifies me in asking your kind indulgence for a little while.

Dr. Garfield, under Executive order, has again assumed charge of the fuel proposition. Mr. Hines, Director of Railways, who has been acting as the agent of Dr. Garfield, is transporting and delivering that coal. The coal is being carried all over this country—to New England and to the far western States—and it is being delivered without the knowledge of the operator, the producer, as to who is getting it, and therefore the operator has no opportunity, has had none, to invoice it to the person or corporation to whom it is ultimately delivered. The result of that is—and I am speaking for 400 coal operators in my district—that the coal operators are without money with which to meet their pay rolls. Those operators have been calling upon the banks for help, but the banks have exhausted their power, having loaned money until their legal reserve has been reached or impaired.

Now, I have received within the last few days many telegrams, and one of them I ask permission to read. It is addressed to me at this city, and is as follows:

WELCH, W. VA., December 10, 1919.

Hon. WELLS GOODYKOONTZ,  
Washington, D. C.:

We have outstanding for coal shipments during last week October and all November \$208,433.04. Of this amount we have been advised that \$13,926.02 has been turned over to several railroads; \$20,993.74 has been diverted to regional committees but not to final consignees; while \$173,563.28 is outstanding on which we have received no diversion notice, neither has it been delivered to the original consignees. Payment of all these accounts is due to-day. You can see that we will be unable to meet our operating expenses much longer.

CRYSTAL BLOCK COAL COKE CO.,  
CENTRAL POCAHONTAS COAL CO.,  
EDWARD O'TOOLE.

(Signed)

These two companies are of not large financial strength, small in comparison to other companies operating in the great coal region embraced in my district. They are operating in a field that during the strike has been the salvation of the country.

Mr. EVANS of Nevada. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOODYKOONTZ. I will.

Mr. EVANS of Nevada. For my information, I would like to know why the operators only produced 50 per cent of their capacity the last summer.

Mr. GOODYKOONTZ. The operators in my district during this period of time—the time that has elapsed since the Government last assumed charge—have produced more than 100 per cent normal capacity, and the reason they did not produce coal last summer was because Members of this body and certain other men in this country advocated that the consumer should not buy coal then. They said the plan to buy coal was merely a scheme and device—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GOODYKOONTZ. I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from West Virginia asks unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman if he will conclude in five minutes, so that the committee can rise?

Mr. GOODYKOONTZ. Yes; I will do that.

They said that it was a scheme of the operators to induce the people to buy coal; that there was not and would not be any shortage of coal in the country; and that if the people would wait the price of coal would go down.

On this floor I took occasion to say that those who gave this advice assumed a terrible responsibility.

The National Coal Operators Association spent \$80,000 in newspaper advertisements warning the public of the danger of delay in laying in their supply.

Mr. LITTLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from West Virginia yield to the gentleman from Kansas?

Mr. GOODYKOONTZ. I will.

Mr. LITTLE. Was it the Fuel Administration that recommended that the people should not put in a supply of coal last summer?

Mr. GOODYKOONTZ. No. I say it was a Member of this body along with others not connected with the Fuel Administration.

Mr. LITTLE. I think, perhaps, the gentleman may be right about that, but I think the Fuel Department also recommended that.

Mr. GOODYKOONTZ. No. Every sensible man—every man that had any sense at all—wanted the mines to be operating in the summer time as well as in winter in order that these mines should get out the coal which the people of the country required for their consumption as well as to take care of the requirements of foreign countries.

Mr. EVANS of Nevada. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOODYKOONTZ. Yes.

Mr. EVANS of Nevada. In my section, I will say to the gentleman, we were advised early last spring to lay in our coal for our supply.

Mr. GOODYKOONTZ. That advice was sound.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOODYKOONTZ. I will.

Mr. BLANTON. After the recent experience we will not have much trouble from now on in getting people to lay in their coal early, will we?

Mr. GOODYKOONTZ. I am afraid the people will forget.

Mr. BLANTON. The people in my country will not forget it.

Mr. GOODYKOONTZ. We are trying to get some money in some way to enable our coal operators to take care of the financial problem involved.

Now, Mr. Hines, the Director of Railroads, and Dr. Garfield, the Fuel Administrator—a very fine man—have taken up the matter with the governor of the board controlling the regional reserve banks, and they have decided that the regional reserve banks will discount notes executed by the coal operators; but the fact is that the constituent banks, the member banks, who must rediscount the paper, can not take care of that paper. I received notice that over 2,400 cars of coal had been shipped out of my district on day before yesterday. The value of that coal is somewhere in the neighborhood of half a million dollars. This was for only one day. The condition covers more than a month. I should judge it would take somewhere between fifteen and twenty million dollars to take care of these operators in this present stressful situation. What will we do to remedy the situation? The miners must be paid. The records show that the miners are paid in cash, after deducting their commissary account and their rent bill and all that, at least a dollar in cash for each ton of coal mined and shipped. Where is the money to come from to pay these men?

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOODYKOONTZ. Yes.

Mr. EMERSON. The gentleman says the Government takes this coal and delivers it to the respective purchasers?

Mr. GOODYKOONTZ. It takes that coal and transfers it to committees, wherever they are. The Railroad Administration acts as the agent of the Fuel Administrator in delivering coal, but it refuses to act as agent in collecting the price of the coal. This it ought to do.

Mr. EMERSON. Somebody is going to collect the money. Who is going to do that?

Mr. GOODYKOONTZ. There is no one to collect it. I had an operator tell me not long ago that, in 1917, of the coal he shipped he had never found out where 50 cars of his coal had gone to. You now understand the chaotic condition of the coal business and the dilemma of the coal operators of West Virginia to-day.

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOODYKOONTZ. Certainly.

Mr. STEVENSON. Was he ever paid for it?

Mr. GOODYKOONTZ. He has not been. He does not know who got his coal, and it may take two years from now before the coal producer finds out who has been getting his coal.

Mr. WOODS of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOODYKOONTZ. I will be very glad to yield to my good friend from Virginia.

Mr. WOODS of Virginia. Is it possible for the banks in the gentleman's district to accommodate the operators?

Mr. GOODYKOONTZ. I am glad you asked that question. Four days ago the banks in the city of Huntington were within 1½ per cent of their legal reserve, and a two weeks' pay roll was then due; now these banks have reached the limit of their reserve.

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOODYKOONTZ. Yes.

Mr. GARNER. Has the gentleman made any investigation or had any conference with the Fuel Administration or the Railroad Administration with respect to the matter?

Mr. GOODYKOONTZ. I have talked with the agents of the Fuel Administrator and with the assistant director of railroads, and they said, "The regional banks would take care of it." I inquired how they were going to do it. Whenever a constituent bank loans money to a coal operator it takes the operator's note and rediscovers it; but when the bank gets beyond its 10 per cent limit it can not go any further—a national bank can only lend to a customer 10 per cent of its working capital—and the coal operators in my section of the country have gotten all the money the banks can lend them.

In addition to this, the fourth instalment of Government taxes will be due on next Monday. The weak mines in my State are at the end of their row. Lack of money and low price of coal are forcing them to shut down. Something must be done by the Government immediately to relieve the situation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from West Virginia has expired.

Mr. ANTHONY. I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. MADDEN, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 8819) to amend an act entitled "An act making appropriations for the support of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes," approved July 11, 1919, had come to no resolution thereon.

#### ORDER OF BUSINESS TO-MORROW.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CRAMTON. Under the rule is this bill the continuing order to-morrow?

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks either this would be or the Private Calendar.

Mr. MADDEN. You would have to make a motion to go into Committee of the Whole.

Mr. CRAMTON. Can the Speaker give any indication as to whom he will recognize to-morrow?

The SPEAKER. The Chair is disposed to think he will recognize the gentleman from Kansas, but the Chair would prefer not to state definitely this evening.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. To-morrow being pension day, probably the Pension Committee would succeed in getting recognition.

The SPEAKER. As far as the Chair knows the Pension Committee has no business.

Mr. ANTHONY. I was informed that the Pension Committee had no business.

The SPEAKER. That was the impression of the Chair.

Mr. EMERSON. I had some hope that the Private Calendar might be taken up to-morrow.

Mr. EVANS of Nevada. We thought we might probably consider the Private Calendar to-morrow.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. To-morrow would be pension day.

#### SENATE BILL REFERRED.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, Senate bill of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to its appropriate committee, as indicated below:

S. 3187. An act to dispose of a certain strip of public land in Waterville, Me.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

#### ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. ANTHONY. I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 6 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until Friday, December 12, 1919, at 12 o'clock noon.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation required by the Bureau of Public Health Service for printing and binding for the remainder of the current fiscal year (H. Doc. No. 503); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

2. A letter from the Secretary of the United States Shipping Board, transmitting statement of travel performed by the officers and employees of the United States Shipping Board during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919 (H. Doc. No. 504); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

3. A letter from the Secretary of the United States Board of Mediation and Conciliation, transmitting report showing average number of employees receiving increased compensation at the rate of \$240 per annum (H. Doc. No. 505); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

4. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting statement showing the number and designation of persons employed under the appropriation for additional temporary employees, Navy Department, and the annual rate of compensation paid to each (H. Doc. No. 506); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

5. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting supplemental estimate of appropriation required by the Bureau of Naturalization for miscellaneous expenses for the fiscal year 1920 (H. Doc. No. 507); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. PLATT, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 2902) to amend section 5182, Revised Statutes of the United States, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 489), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

#### CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, the Committee on Pensions was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 10723) granting a pension to John E. Broyles, and the same was referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

#### PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. SHREVE: A bill (H. R. 11077) to provide for the purchase of a site and for the erection of a public building thereon at Union City, Pa.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. RAMSEYER: A bill (H. R. 11078) to provide for the extension of aeroplane mail service to the Pacific coast; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 11079) providing for the disposition of the statue of Abraham Lincoln in course of removal from its site in front of the courthouse in the city of Washington, D. C., to the city of Moline, Ill.; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. ROBINSON of North Carolina: A bill (H. R. 11080) to provide for the acquisition by purchase, condemnation, or otherwise, of a site for a public building at Sanford, N. C.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11081) to provide for the erection of a public building at Laurinburg, N. C.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11082) to provide for the erection of a public building at Wadesboro, N. C.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11083) to provide for the erection of a public building at Rockingham, N. C.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11084) to provide for the acquisition by purchase, condemnation, or otherwise, of a site for a public building at Hamlet, N. C.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. CLARK of Florida: A bill (H. R. 11085) to declare certain publications unmaillable and prescribing punishment for its violation; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11086) to prohibit certain persons engaging in business in the District of Columbia and the Territories of the

United States, and to punish its violation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PLATT: A bill (H. R. 11087) to regulate the filling of vacancies in the Corps of Cadets at the United States Military Academy not otherwise provided for by existing law; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WASON: A bill (H. R. 11088) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Peterborough, in the State of New Hampshire; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. SIEGEL: A bill (H. R. 11089) to provide for the punishment of the crime of anarchy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Washington: A bill (H. R. 11090) providing for a survey of the Columbia River between Chinook, Wash., and the head of Sand Island; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. BROOKS of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 11091) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Yorkhaven, Pa., two cannons, with suitable number of shells; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Washington: A bill (H. R. 11092) for the exclusion, deportation, and expulsion of certain aliens, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. WHEELER: Resolution (H. Res. 417) to provide for the appointment of a clerk to the Committee on Railways and Canals; to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. BABKA: Resolution (H. Res. 418) directing an investigation of the reported hoarding of sugar; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. ROGERS: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 261) to make immediately available the appropriation for the expenses of regulating further the entry of aliens into the United States; to the Committee on Appropriations.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ASHBROOK: A bill (H. R. 11093) granting an increase of pension to Joseph S. Hall; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CLEARY: A bill (H. R. 11094) granting a pension to May Gantert Lace; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. COPLEY: A bill (H. R. 11095) granting an increase of pension to Theresa Brisbois; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HADLEY: A bill (H. R. 11096) granting an increase of pension to Vernom Van Houten; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HAYS: A bill (H. R. 11097) granting an increase of pension to John A. Keltner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HERSMAN: A bill (H. R. 11098) granting an increase of pension to Charles Asa Clark; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11099) to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to lease San Miguel Island, Calif., and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. HICKS: A bill (H. R. 11100) granting an increase of pension to Leonard T. Butler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOWARD: A bill (H. R. 11101) granting an increase of pension to John J. Spencer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11102) for the relief of Dr. L. A. O'Brien; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HUDDLESTON: A bill (H. R. 11103) granting an increase of pension to Henry Chairsell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KING: A bill (H. R. 11104) granting a pension to Milo Conner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11105) granting a pension to Charles Diesron; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MCKENZIE: A bill (H. R. 11106) granting a pension to Dora Myers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RUCKER: A bill (H. R. 11107) granting an increase of pension to John Canote; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SIEGEL: A bill (H. R. 11108) granting an increase of pension to Laura E. Valteau; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 11109) granting a pension to Charles Roddy; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11110) granting a pension to Palace Douglas; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. TOWNER: A bill (H. R. 11111) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Sheline; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WASON: A bill (H. R. 11112) granting an increase of pension to Frank Libby; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

263. By Mr. BRIGGS: Petition of Plainview Lodge, No. 1175, Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks, demanding deportation of undesirable aliens; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

264. By Mr. BURDICK: Resolution of a mass meeting of the United Jewry of Rhode Island, in Providence, R. I., November 30, 1919, requesting the Government of the United States to place before the supreme council of the peace conference the atrocities being waged against the Jewish people of Ukraina and other lands to the end that the atrocities be stopped; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

265. Also, resolution of the city council of Providence, R. I., indorsing the bill now pending providing for a daylight-saving plan applicable to New England; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

266. By Mr. CULLEN: Petition of the Allied Council of American Shoe and Leather Industries and Trades, protesting against discrimination by Indian Government to tanners of the British Empire; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

267. By Mr. DICKINSON of Iowa: Petition of retail dealers and merchants of Lake Mills, Iowa, protesting against the tax of the Siegel bill, H. R. 8315; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

268. By Mr. DICKINSON of Missouri: Petition of Warrensburg Lodge, No. 673, Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks; Sedalia Lodge, No. 125, Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks; Joplin Lodge, No. 501, Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks, all of the State of Missouri, denouncing activities of Industrial Workers of the World and Bolsheviki; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

269. By Mr. ESCH: Petition of Missouri and Kansas publishers, concerning solution of paper shortage; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

270. Also, petition of Fond du Lac Post, No. 75, American Legion, demanding deportation of Victor L. Berger and proper investigation of the record of Representative VOIGT; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

271. Also, petition of St. Columelle Branch, Friends of Irish Freedom, favoring recognition of republic of Ireland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

272. Also, petition of the Allied Council of American Shoe and Leather Industries and Trades, protesting against discrimination by Indian Government to tanners of the British Empire; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

273. By Mr. FORDNEY: Petition of Southern Oil & Transport Co. and other oil companies holding interest in oil wells in Mexico, protesting against methods taken by the Mexican Government in closing oil wells in Mexico; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

274. By Mr. FULLER of Illinois: Petition of Ancient Order of Hibernians and Ladies' Auxiliary of La Salle, Ill., favoring House bill 3404; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

275. Also, petition of the Farmers' National Council opposing Cummins and Esch bills; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

276. By Mr. GALLIVAN: Petition of Patrick O'Rourke and Claremens Association of Boston, Mass., favoring H. R. 3404; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

277. Also, petition of Boston Gaelic School condemning statements and articles by Admiral Sims; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

278. By Mr. HULINGS: Petition of Sharon Lodge No. 103 Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks, condemning activities of I. W. W. and Bolsheviki; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

279. Also, petition of Southern Oil & Transport Co. and other oil companies protesting against the methods employed by the Mexican Government in seizing oil wells in Mexico; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

280. By Mr. HUTCHINSON: Petition of Board of Commissioners of Trenton, N. J., favoring legislation providing for daylight saving; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

281. By Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island: Resolutions of city council of Providence, R. I., indorsing daylight-saving plan for New England; to the Committee on Agriculture.

282. Also, petition of Sarsfield Literary Association, favoring House bill 3404; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

283. Also, petition of New England governors regarding railroad conditions in New England; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

284. Also, petition of New England governors for suitable recognition in rank be given to Maj. Gen. Clarence R. Edwards; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

285. Also, petition of New England governors that the United States Shipping Board allocate some of its large ships to the New England owners, operators, and managers of steamers; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

286. By Mr. MAHER: Petition of E. J. Duffy Branch, Friends of Irish Freedom, favoring House bill 3404; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

287. Also, petition of New York Commandery, Military Order of the Loyal Legion, asking additional compensation for volunteer officers who served in the War 1861-1865; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

288. By Mr. MERRITT: Petition of Combined Jewish Organizations, of Bridgeport, Conn., protesting against the massacre of Jews in Ukraine and other lands; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

289. By Mr. O'CONNELL: Petition of the Allied Council of the American Shoe and Leather Industries and Trades, protesting against discrimination by the Indian Government to tanners of the British Empire; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

290. Also, petition of Farmers' National Council, opposing Cummins and Esch bills; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

291. Also, petition of New York State Association of Supervisory Post Office Employees, favoring Sterling-Lehbach retirement bill; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

292. By Mr. RAMSEYER: Petition of Howard Cessna Post, No. 136, Iowa Branch, American Legion, pledging support in upholding law and order and condemning activities of Industrial Workers of the World; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

293. Also, petition of Harry Anderson Post, No. 34, American Legion, protesting against the activities of the Industrial Workers of the World; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

294. Also, petition of American Red Cross, Service Star, Legion, and Commercial Club of Oskaloosa, Iowa, favoring legislation to make November 11 a national holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

295. Also, petition of Oscar B. Nelson Post, No. 3, American Legion, Ottumwa, Iowa, favoring that the bodies of the soldiers who died on the fields of France be brought back to this country for burial; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

296. By Mr. RIVORDAN: Petition of J. Mitchel, Friends of Irish Freedom, favoring recognition of the republic of Ireland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

297. By Mr. ROWAN: Petition of J. P. Holland Branch, Friends of Irish Freedom, favoring House bill 3404; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

298. Also, petition of Missouri and Kansas publishers regarding solution for paper shortage; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

299. Also, petition of A. M. Upjohn, regarding conditions in Alaska and urging recognition of the Republic of Armenia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

300. Also, petition of Public Ledger, Philadelphia, forwarding copy of letter sent to the President regarding methods of reducing popular unrest; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

301. Also, petition of Southern Oil & Transport Co. and other oil companies, regarding the methods employed by the Mexican Government in seizing the oil wells in Mexico; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

302. Also, petition of Farmers' National Council, opposing Cummins and Esch bills; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

303. Also, petition of the Allied Council of American Shoe and Leather Industries and Trades, protesting against discrimination by the Indian Government to tanners of the British Empire; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

304. By Mr. WINSLOW: Petition of Patriotic Order Sons of America, on Mexican situation; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

305. Also, petition of Patriotic Order Sons of America, on remedy for the high cost of living; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

## SENATE.

FRIDAY, December 12, 1919.

The Chaplain, Rev. Forrest J. Prettyman, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, we present ourselves to Thee with hearts we trust responsive to the divine will, with readiness to hear Thy command and to follow Thy purpose. We pray that Thou wilt guide us in the discharge of our duties so that we may ever have the comfortable satisfaction of knowing that we are working together with God in the great task of the present day. For Christ's sake. Amen.

THOMAS P. GORE, a Senator from the State of Oklahoma, appeared in his seat to-day.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll. The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ball	Harris	McNary	Sheppard
Capper	Harrison	Moses	Smith, S. C.
Cuberson	Johnson, S. Dak.	Myers	Smoot
Cummins	Jones, N. Mex.	New	Spencer
Dial	Jones, Wash.	Newberry	Trammell
Edge	Kellogg	Norris	Underwood
Elkins	Keyes	Nugent	Wadsworth
Fletcher	Kirby	Overman	Warren
Gay	Knox	Page	
Hale	La Follette	Phipps	
Harding	Lenroot	Ransdell	

Mr. LENROOT. The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] requested me to announce his temporary absence on important business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Forty-one Senators have answered to the roll call. There is not a quorum present. The Secretary will call the roll of absentees.

The Secretary called the names of the absent Senators, and Mr. ASHURST, Mr. CALDER, Mr. COLE, Mr. FERNALD, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. HITCHCOCK, Mr. STERLING, Mr. THOMAS, Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts, Mr. WALSH of Montana, and Mr. WATSON answered to their names when called.

Mr. KING, Mr. POMERENE, Mr. FALL, Mr. MCLEAN, Mr. GRONNA, Mr. CURTIS, Mr. MCKELLAR, Mr. SUTHERLAND, Mr. BANKHEAD, Mr. NELSON, Mr. TOWNSEND, and Mr. GORE entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I wish to announce that the Senator from Nevada [Mr. PITTMAN] and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON] are detained from the Senate by illness in their families.

Mr. SHEPPARD. The senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BECKHAM], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. OWEN], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. SHEPHERD], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SIMMONS], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. SMITH], and the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. STANLEY] are absent on official business.

Mr. KING. The Senator from Oregon [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN] and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. SMITH] are detained from the Senate on public business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Sixty-four Senators have answered to the roll call. There is a quorum present. The Secretary will read the Journal of the proceedings of the preceding session.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of the proceedings of the legislative day of Wednesday, December 10, 1919, when, on request of Mr. SMOOT and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

## UNITED STATES SHIPPING BOARD (H. DOC. NO. 504).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the United States Shipping Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, a statement of travel performed by officers and employees of the United States Shipping Board during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1919, which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Commerce and ordered to be printed.

## UNITED STATES BOARD OF MEDIATION AND CONCILIATION (H. DOC. NO. 505).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the United States Board of Mediation and Conciliation, transmitting, pursuant to law, a statement showing for the first four months of the current fiscal year the average number of employees receiving increased compensation at the rate of \$240 per annum, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.